Meeting #41-1

STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF MEETING HELD IN:
ROOM 338, MICHAEL J. SMITH MEMORIAL CENTER, PORTLAND STATE
UNIVERSITY, PORTLAND, OREGON

July 23 and August 27, 1973

MEETING #41-1
A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in Room 338, Michael J. Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

ROLL CALL
The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M. (P.D.T.), Monday, July 23, 1973, by the President of the Board, Mr. George H. Layman, and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. George H. Corey
Mrs. Elizabeth H. Johnson
Mr. Philip A. Jose
Mr. Robert D. Holmes

Mr. John W. Snider
Mr. Lorin L. Stewart
Mr. Edward G. Westerdahl II
Mr. George H. Layman

Absent: Mr. John D. Yosser was on vacation.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities--Chancellor R. E. Lieuallen; Secretary D. R. Larson; Mr. Freeman Holser, Vice Chancellor for Administration; Mr. J. I. Hunderup, Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning; Dr. Miles C. Romney, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Mr. H. A. Bork, Consultant; Mr. J. L. Watson, Controller; Mr. K. L. Jackson, Budget Director; Dr. George Dier, Director, Communications Development; Mr. John B. Leshy, Assistant Attorney General; Dr. James Bernal, Director, Teaching Research Division; Mr. Mike Stewart, Business Manager, Teaching Research Division; Mr. Dave Quenzer, Budget Officer; Mr. Ennis Wolfe, Legal Analyst; Mr. John Richardson, Assistant to the Chancellor; Miss Linda Gabrielson, Information Representative.

Oregon State University—President R. W. MacVicar; Mr. M. Popovich, Dean of Administration; Dr. David B. Nicodemus, Dean of Faculty.

University of Oregon—President Robert D. Clark; Dr. Gerald Rogan, Vice President for Students; Mr. W. H. McLaughlin, Business Manager; Dr. William D. Korns, Director, University Relations.

University of Oregon Medical School—Dean C. N. Holman; Mr. W. A. Zimmerman, Associate Dean for Business Affairs.

University of Oregon Dental School—Dean L. C. Tarkla; Mr. Eugene Bauer, Assistant Dean for Business Affairs.

Portland State University—President Gregory B. Wolfe; Mr. W. T. Lemmon, Vice President for Business Affairs; Mr. Robert Low, Vice President for Administration; Dr. Joseph Blumel, Vice President for Academic Affairs; Mr. R. L. Merrick, Business Manager.

Oregon College of Education—President L. W. Rice; Dr. Ronald L. Chatham, Assistant to the President.

Southern Oregon College—President James K. Sours.

Eastern Oregon College—President A. M. Rempel.

Oregon Technical Institute—President W. D. Purvine.

Others—Mrs. Maxine Warnath, Assistant Professor of Psychology at Oregon College of Education, representing the American Association of University Professors Federation; Mr. Gilbert Polanski, Field Representative, Oregon State Employees Association; Mrs. Jeanne Keenan, Executive Director, FOES; Mr. Bernard Seifeld, Program Specialist, Educational Coordinating Council; Dr. Beatrice K. Rose, Member, Oregon State Board of Health; Mr. Carl Fisher, Director of Development and Mr. Jim Dunn, Development Officer, University of Oregon; Miss Sarah C. Hayes, representative of the Ashland Branches of the American Association of University Professors and Business and Professional Women; Mrs. Linda G. Stevenson and Mrs. Mary Ruth Voeding, representing the Ashland Branch of the American Association of University Women; Dr. R. O. McNair, Chairman, and Dr. Richard Scott, Vice Chairman, Interinstitutional Faculty Council; Mrs. Dawn Dressler, Chairman, Advisory Council, Portland State University.
Student Representatives—Mr. Michael Doran and Mr. Dennis Gilbert, representing the Amazon Cooperating Tenants; Mr. Don Chalmers, President, Student Bar Association, University of Oregon Law School; Mr. Greg Leo, President, Associated Students, University of Oregon; Mr. Steve Lamb, Chairman, Student Senate, Associated Students, Oregon College of Education; Miss Valerie McIntyre, Student, University of Oregon; Mr. Ralph LaVelle Blondell, Graduate Student in Sociology, Portland State University; Mr. John Nickelson, representing the Socialist Workers Party.

The Board voted to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on May 22 and June 26, 1973, and approved them as printed in the preliminary minutes previously issued.

The Chancellor called attention to the annual report of gifts and grants which was distributed along with additional background information on each of the types of gifts, grants and contracts received. He indicated the report provided a summary of the source of gifts in two major categories—federal and other kinds of gifts and grants. The report indicated totals for the current biennium in comparison with the two previous biennia.

The Chancellor said federal funds received by the State System varied between $89 million and $91 million during the three biennia. The funds received from other sources ranged from $99 million in 1967-1969 to $107 million in 1971-1973. The amounts estimated from each of the sources in the 1973-1975 biennial budget is somewhat higher than the totals shown in the report and may prove to be somewhat optimistic.

The report as distributed appears below:

### SUMMARY OF GIFTS AND GRANTS TO OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION 1972-73

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURPOSE OF GIFT</th>
<th>SOURCE OF GIFTS</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction &amp; Department Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,329,167.00</td>
<td>$813,728.53</td>
<td>$10,142,895.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized Activities Related To Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>253,830.00</td>
<td>97,509.57</td>
<td>351,339.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,988,918.48</td>
<td>1,963,935.18</td>
<td>25,952,853.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sponsored Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,161,425.10</td>
<td>1,147,937.80</td>
<td>3,609,362.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension &amp; Public Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,066,486.63</td>
<td>1,567,660.40</td>
<td>4,574,147.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td>78,660.00</td>
<td>850.00</td>
<td>79,510.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,465.80</td>
<td>161,248.00</td>
<td>181,713.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,739,054.50</td>
<td>948,333.93</td>
<td>2,687,388.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE OF GIFT</td>
<td>SOURCE OF GIFTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>1,434,915.00</td>
<td>153,771.52</td>
<td>1,588,686.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Study Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>1,544,143.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,544,143.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition to Endowment Principal—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$73,329.38</td>
<td>$73,329.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition to Endowment Principal—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Other Than Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72,778.60</td>
<td>72,778.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts &amp; Grants Expended Through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budgets of the Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>146,138.35</td>
<td>631,828.94</td>
<td>777,967.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books, Supplies &amp; Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>74,500.00</td>
<td>570,743.91</td>
<td>645,243.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>345,958.27</td>
<td>345,958.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>$44,077,733.86</td>
<td>$8,554,634.03</td>
<td>$52,632,367.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>46,841,068.35</td>
<td>7,093,397.64</td>
<td>54,934,466.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 1971-1973 Biennium</td>
<td>$90,918,802.21</td>
<td>$15,647,031.67</td>
<td>$106,565,833.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>40,342,981.44</td>
<td>6,316,203.81</td>
<td>46,659,185.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>50,762,436.77</td>
<td>6,201,051.03</td>
<td>57,263,487.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 1969-1971 Biennium</td>
<td>$91,105,418.21</td>
<td>$12,517,254.84</td>
<td>$103,622,673.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>47,504,347.16</td>
<td>4,681,351.54</td>
<td>52,185,698.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>51,670,278.75</td>
<td>5,283,430.50</td>
<td>57,143,373.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 1967-1969 Biennium</td>
<td>$99,174,625.91</td>
<td>$10,964,782.04</td>
<td>$110,139,408.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chancellor said the Educational Coordinating Council had recently reviewed the circumstances facing Southern Oregon College and Rogue Community College with respect to expanding educational opportunities in the Medford area. The Educational Coordinating Council considered a report prepared by consultants which called for the creation in the Jackson County area of an educational advisory committee to assist the institutions in determining any necessary steps for the improvement of these educational services.

The Chancellor said he had asked that the Academic Affairs Committee discuss these issues so that the Board could respond to the proposal that some further action be taken by the Board to improve the situation in the Medford area.

In response to questions from the Board, the Chancellor indicated that there had been no discussion of the expansion of vocational-technical education into the secondary schools where it would be available to everyone. However, he said this would be an appropriate subject for the Academic Affairs Committee to review in terms of its study of educational opportunity. He also said there is a legal provision for establishment of an area educational district in the community which could enter into a contract with the Board to provide for community college instruction along with regular four-year college instruction.
Meeting #11-4

July 23, 1973

Parking Improvements, SOC

Staff Report to the Board

On July 24, 1972, the Board was informed of a plan for land acquisition and parking improvements at Southern Oregon College increasing the number of paved spaces from 458 available in 1971-72 to approximately 1,403 in 1975-76. During this same period, the number of rough-graded and graveled spaces is expected to be reduced from 1,000 to approximately 950, so the net gain would be about 343 spaces (from a total of 1,490 in 1971-72 to approximately 1,823 in 1975-76). It was noted that the parking plan had been correlated with the long-range master plan for the development of the campus, anticipating that certain temporary parking lots would be removed as the sites were required for building construction, and other areas would be improved for more permanent parking spaces.

Consistent with this program, the Board authorized a request to the 1973 Legislature for authorization to expend $170,000 during 1973-1975 for the acquisition of additional sites and for various improvements for vehicular parking, all to be financed from bond borrowings issued under the provisions of Article XI-P(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or balances available from parking operations. The capital outlay program approved by the Legislature included this item.

Southern Oregon College officials have filed with the Board's Office plans for the improvement of Parking Lot #14, which is located north of Ashland Street and east of Palm Avenue, immediately south of Taylor Hall. The estimated cost thereof is approximately $50,000, including grading, paving, lighting, drainage, curbing and related work, such as sidewalks, landscaping, etc. Upon completion of the project, the lot would provide paved parking space for approximately 126 automobiles and several two-wheeled vehicles.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the plans prepared by the Physical Plant Department of Southern Oregon College for the improvements to Parking Lot #14 be approved and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to solicit bids and award a contract for such improvements within a project budget of approximately $50,000 out of the expenditure limitation of $170,000 approved by the 1973 Legislature for various parking improvements, including land, at Southern Oregon College. Such action would be contingent upon release of authorization by the State Emergency Board as contemplated by Enrolled House Bill 5097 (1973 Regular Session). Funds required for the work are to be provided from bond borrowings issued under the provisions of Article XI-P(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or balances available from parking operations.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF PLANNING

Project - Southern Oregon College Parking Improvements, including Land

Legislative authorization - Enrolled House Bill 5097, 1973 Regular Session

Board's priority - No. 3 in 1973-1975 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Approximate gross area - 65,000 square feet

Total project cost - $170,000

Total direct construction costs - $50,000

Financing plan - Article XI-P(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available from parking operations - $170,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.

In response to a question during the discussion, Mr. Hunderup indicated the request to the 1973 Legislature for $170,000 was for conversion of temporary parking lots into more permanent lots. This would reduce the dust problem adjacent to the campus. The request also included the acquisition of land within the existing approved campus boundaries.
Purchase of Foyer Property, SOU

Staff Report to the Board

Mr. E. D. Foyer, an elderly widower, has offered to sell to the Board the property which he owns at 176 and 186 Wightman Street, Ashland, which is within the approved projected campus boundaries for Southern Oregon College. The site contains approximately 6.12 acres with frontage of approximately 802 feet on the east side of Wightman Street, excluding the 50-foot portion at 164 Wightman Street (the former Turner property) acquired earlier this year. The two-bedroom residence at 186 Wightman Street was constructed circa 1955 and contains approximately 1,068 square feet. Because of its age and general deterioration, it has no value. Similarly, the garage and outbuildings located on the property have relatively little, if any, value. The other residence, located at 176 Wightman Street, was constructed in the early 1940's and has an area of approximately 648 square feet plus a finished attic of about 405 square feet. Most of the value of the property is in the land, which extends northerly to the railroad tracks.

The Board owns all of the other property within this portion of the campus between Wightman Street and Walker Avenue and between Iowa Street and the Southern Pacific Railroad. Negotiations for the purchase of this property have extended over a number of years. Mr. Foyer plans to move from Ashland and has offered to sell the property for $35,000, which is in line with the appraisals obtained by the College. Inasmuch as the property is within an area designated for future educational and general use, the funds to finance the acquisition would be provided from the General Fund appropriation in 1971 and/or from bond borrowings authorized under Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution.

Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning be authorized to purchase the Foyer property at 176 and 186 Wightman Street, Ashland, for $35,000 financed from state funds (General Fund appropriation and/or Article XI-G bond borrowings).

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

In December 1971 and March 1972, the Board approved plans for three units of the complex of Oceanography Research Service Facilities at Oregon State University involving expenditures of approximately $122,100 out of the expenditure limitation of $200,000 approved by the 1971 Legislature. These industrial-type buildings (a Core Laboratory unit, a Geophysics Laboratory unit and an Oceanography Laboratory Warehouse) have been completed and are now in use. It was noted that additional units would be proposed as the planning for them was completed and as research overhead monies or other grants become available.

Institutional officials have filed with the Board’s Office the plans and specifications which the Physical Plant Department has prepared for the next unit, a physical oceanography service laboratory building. This prefabricated metal building would contain a gross area of approximately 2,400 square feet. It would be of rigid steel frame construction on a concrete floor and foundation and would have a pitched roof. The exterior surface would be of painted metal panels similar to the units already completed within this complex east of 30th Street, north of Western Avenue, across from the Forest Research Laboratory. Its location would be along Western Avenue, immediately south of the initial units.

The physical oceanography service laboratory would be used for several on-going research programs:

1. Instrumentation development and check-out for air-sea interaction research sponsored by the Office of Naval Research.
2. Instrumentation check-out and calibration for mesoscale wind field research sponsored by the National Science Foundation.
3. Instrumentation check-out and field staging for precipitation mechanism research sponsored by the National Science Foundation.
4. Instrumentation check-out and calibration for coastal upwelling research sponsored as part of the National Decade of Oregon Exploration program of the National Science Foundation.
5. Experiment staging by various smaller federally sponsored programs.
Of the total budget of $35,000, the direct construction costs are estimated to be about $32,000, averaging about $13.33 per square foot.

Funds for the project are available from building use credits applicable to instructional and research contracts and grants.

Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the plans and specifications for the proposed physical oceanography service laboratory building at Oregon State University be approved and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to award a construction contract therefor within a total of approximately $35,000, subject to the release of research overhead funds by the State Emergency Board.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Naming of Nine Buildings, OSU

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the request of administrative officials of Oregon State University, following careful review by the University Building Committee, it is proposed that nine buildings be named after individuals who have contributed to the development of the institution and its programs in some extraordinary way:

1. **Dixon Recreation Center** (Intramural/Recreation Building currently under construction)
   - The proposed name is a memorial to James (Jim) Victor Dixon, who was a student, athlete, teacher, coach, intramural director, recreation department chairman and acting director during his long tenure at Oregon State University. He was considered the "father of athletic image" for many young coaches and athletes throughout the state, a man characterized by the captain of the 1942 Rose Bowl team as portraying all the attributes of physical recreation during his lifetime. Endorsements for naming the new facility for Jim Dixon have come from other former students, a state representative, members of the Alumni Association, supporters of the Oregon State University athletic program, the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, and the Department of Physical Education.

2. **Li House** (Apartment Housing at Yaquina Bay Marine Science Center, Newport)
   - Jerome (Jerry) C. R. Li, first chairman of the Oregon State University Department of Statistics, taught mathematics from 1946 to 1962, and statistics from 1955 to 1962. He received the Carter Award for inspirational teaching in 1953. In 1968, the statistics faculty established in his name an annual award to the outstanding graduate student in statistics.

3. **Dr. Li**
   - Dr. Li participated actively on campus committees. He also wrote "Numerical Mathematics" and the widely translated two volume "Introduction to Statistical Inference." He left Oregon State University in 1962 to rest and write in Taiwan, returning to the campus three years later for a six-month stay.

4. **Dr. Li**
   - Dr. Li was born September 9, 1914, Tientsin, China. He graduated from the University of Nanking, later studied at the University of Chicago, and earned the Ph.D. at Iowa State College. He died December 17, 1969, in Taipei, Taiwan.

5. **Substantial support for the Yaquina Bay Marine Science Center housing facility came from resources provided through the Oregon State University Foundation from Dr. Li's estate.**

6. **Clark Laboratory** (East Science Laboratory)
   - Rolland L. "R. L." Clark, whose long and significant involvement in livestock business in Oregon included many years' membership on the board of directors of the Pacific International Livestock Exposition, civic leadership and the two-term presidency of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, was closely associated with Oregon State University for a large share of his long and active life. As president of the "P. I." for 14 years, he was active in 4-H and other youth events connected with the Exposition. For 25 years he served as president of the Agricultural Research Foundation, an independent foundation established to support research in agricultural, biological and related social sciences at Oregon State University.
Mr. Clark was born June 15, 1882, in Clarkeburg, Indiana. He attended Ohio Wesleyan University, attaining the Bachelor of Literature degree in 1907. He began his long affiliation with a Portland livestock commission partnership in 1915. Mr. Clark died April 20, 1971.

Rosenfeld Laboratory (Research Laboratory Building at Horse Center)

Some of the income from the significant bequest of Walter J. Rosenfeld, Portland businessman, in support of agricultural research has been used in the establishment of the Horse Center facilities at Oregon State University. The Department of Animal Science suggests that the area specifically designated for research would be most appropriately named in honor of Mr. Rosenfeld.

Mr. Rosenfeld was born August 24, 1880, and died on July 1, 1963.

Manchester Riding Arena (Arena at Horse Center)

Max Milton Manchester, ardent horseman and longtime member and director of the Oregon Horseman’s Association, was the person primarily responsible for initiating legislation that culminated in the construction of the Oregon State University Horse Center.

Mr. Manchester was Director of the Oregon Public Employees Retirement System for many years. His outside interests centered largely on the horse industry. He served as president of the Portland Hunt Club, and was a recognized Steward and Judge of the American Horse Shows Association. He managed many horse shows in the Northwest, including the Pacific International Livestock Exposition Horse Show and the Oregon Arabian Horse Breeders Association Show.

His interest in and contributions to the light horse industry would be memorialized effectively in the designation of the riding arena in his name.

Mr. Manchester was born December 4, 1913, and died October 8, 1969.

Langton Hall (Men’s Gymnasium)

Dr. Clair V. Langton came to Oregon State from Michigan in 1928 as director of health and physical education, continuing in that position for 36 years. During his long tenure, he won numerous honors for his work in health and physical education. They included the distinguished service award from the Oregon Public Health Association, the national Gulick Award in physical education, and district and national awards from the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (AAHPER). He was co-author of four books on hygiene and health.

Dr. Langton’s interest in health and physical education continued beyond his retirement from the faculty. He maintained an active relationship with the American Academy of Physical Education, and attended the national meeting of AAHPER a week before his death on April 19, 1973.

Wiegand Hall (Food Technology Building)

Ernest Herman Wiegand, one of the pioneers in professional food technology, organized the first four-year college curriculum in food technology in 1919 at then Oregon State Agricultural College. His many students have been employed throughout the food industry, in educational institutions, and in government. His numerous contributions and activities provided incentives and leadership which led to establishment of Oregon and the Northwest as a major economically important fruit, vegetable, and seafood processing area.

Largely through "Prof" Wiegand’s leadership, the present Food Technology Building came into existence in 1951, a symbol of his contributions.

Professor Wiegand continued to play an active role in the food industry as a consultant following his retirement from Oregon State University in 1952. His achievements brought him many honors including the Nicholas Appert Award, the Oregon State University Distinguished Service Award, and in 1971, election as a Fellow of the International Institute of Food Technologists.

Moreland Hall (Old Forestry Building)

W. W. Moreland, member of the faculty of Corvallis College, served as Clerk of the State Legislature during vacation months in 1868. It was his alertness in noting that the land grant of 1862 under the Morrill Act, which allowed Oregon 90,000 acres of land as a perpetual endowment for a state agricultural college, had not been accepted by the Legislature, and that the time limit for acceptance was about to expire. Mr. Moreland urged the Legislature to act before it was too late.

Competing with Corvallis College for the federal grant was Willamette University. It was in part the brilliant intellect of Mr. Moreland that gave Corvallis College tentative designation as the State Agricultural College. Efforts of President Pinkey, Mr. Moreland and associates to meet conditions imposed by both congressional and legislative acts achieved such convincing results that the Legislature of 1870 designated and permanently adopted Corvallis College as the Agricultural College of the State of Oregon.

The story is recalled in the "Orange & Black," published by the Oregon State University Alumni Association in 1938.

Nash Hall (Bioscience Building)

Wallis Nash, British-born lawyer, typifies the spirit of the development of the State of Oregon and the school that came to be Oregon State University. He, more than others, clearly saw the potential of the University in its role of service as a land grant university to the people of the state.

Mr. Nash served as secretary of the Board of Regents of Oregon Agricultural College from 1865 to 1898, and was instrumental in bringing such personages as Margaret Snell to the campus. He was aware of the importance of the human resources of the state and the young people the University was to train. Through his own study and writing, he did much to identify the importance of the natural and agricultural resources of Oregon.

Outdoor sportsman and naturalist, musician, railroad official, public-spirited citizen, and sponsor of scientific agricultural practices the versatile Mr. Nash also wrote four books: "Oregon Reports on Land in Benton County," "Oregon There and Back in 1877," "Two Years in Oregon," and, in 1919, "A Lawyer's Life on Two Continents."

Mr. Nash was born in 1839 and died near Nashville, Oregon, (named for him) on March 13, 1926.

Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the request of administrative officials of Oregon State University to name the nine buildings outlined above in honor of persons who have made significant contributions to the institution and its programs be approved by the Board.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

(Considered by Finance Committee and the Board and approved subject to public hearing on July 23, 1973.)

Staff Report to the Board

The Law School tuition and fees schedule was considered at several meetings of the Finance Committee and the Board. At the Board meeting on May 22, 1973, Mr. Mosser distributed modifications in the tuition and fee schedule previously considered and also copies of proposals submitted by the Law School from Dean Scoles and Mr. Don Chalmers, President of the Student Bar Association. Mr. Mosser moved that the Board approve the modified recommendations which he had presented at the request of the Finance Committee.

Following further discussion, Mr. Mosser moved to amend his previous motion so that the Law School admission acceptance fee would be $100 effective in 1974-75 and subsequent years.
The Board approved the amendment with Mrs. Johnson voting no. The Board then approved the following fee schedule as proposed and amended by Mr. Mosser, subject to public hearing at the July 23 Board meeting:

- **Law School Application Fee** $20
- **University Application Fee** $10
- **School of Law Admission Acceptance Fee** - $100 beginning in 1974-75 and succeeding years
- **Law Study Resources Fee** - $100 for 1973-74; $200 for 1974-75; $300 for 1975-76 and succeeding years.
- **Tuition** - $630, representing the regular graduate fee and subject to variations of graduate fees.
- **Building Fee** $30
- **Health Service Fee** $37.50

The Law School incidental fee was not approved and students will continue to pay the regular University incidental fee.

It was understood that the waivers were authorized for 30 percent of potential income in 1973-74; 20 percent in 1974-75; and 10 percent in 1975-76, on the basis of financial need and in accordance with the plan issued by the School of Law.

The net revenue from the approved fees are to be allocated to the budget of the Law School with special emphasis on deficiencies in the library. It was stated that this program is experimental, it is not a precedent for other graduate schools or departments and a report on the program is to be made to the Board in 1975-76.

**Board Discussion and Action**

President Layman indicated that presentations in connection with the public hearing on the Law School tuition and fees schedule were in order. He recognized Mr. Don Chalmers, President of the Student Bar Association, for the purpose of making a statement with respect to the tuition and fees schedule.

Mr. Chalmers said that when the students and administration of the Law School had discussed an increase in fees, it had been understood that any fees that were levied would be levied in lieu of any tuition increase. He said it is apparent this is not going to be the situation. He asked the Board to consider the following factors in reaching its decision on Law School tuition and fees:

1. The Board has not given the same level of support to law school students as it has to graduate school students in general. Law School students pay a substantially greater portion of the cost of their instruction than do other graduate students.

2. The Law School is changing from a term to a semester system which allows Law School students only two months instead of three to earn money for the expenses of their education.

3. There is a lack of notice as to the increased tuition and fees. Some notice was given with respect to fees, but a final determination is pending on levels of tuition for graduate students. If graduate tuition is increased, Law School students will be paying an even greater proportion of the cost of instruction.

Mr. Chalmers urged the Board to reconsider its decision of May 22, 1973, so that the special fee increases for Law School students approved by the Board at that meeting would be reduced by the amount of any tuition increase which the Board may approve for 1973-74.

Mr. Layman pointed out that the proposals for the fee increases had originated from the Law School rather than from the Board and that the Law School recommendations had been changed in the various proposals submitted to the Board. He also said it had been made clear that no commitment could be made with respect to maintaining tuition at the same level because if tuition were raised for other students, it would be necessary to raise it for students in the Law School.
Mr. Chalmers said he recognized a tuition increase would be applied to all students, but he was asking that the amount of the tuition increase be subtracted from the previously approved fees.

Mrs. Johnson suggested the Law School students provide detailed financial information on the resources available for each student to meet the Law School tuition and fees. "She also mentioned that consideration should be given to nonresident tuition for the Law School because qualified Oregon residents may be forced to go elsewhere for legal education at a considerably higher cost as nonresidents while at the same time nonresidents are being admitted to the University of Oregon Law School at resident rates.

Mr. Chalmers indicated the Law School Student Body Association was in the process of preparing a proposal for a deferral payment plan to apply to the entire State System. He said it would be similar to the Ohio tuition plan.

Since there were no other individuals who wished to be heard on the question of the Law School tuition and fees, the Board then voted to approve the tuition and fee schedule as recommended.

Mr. Corey said he favored the proposal as presented pending a further consideration of a greater separation of the Law School and the Graduate School.

Mrs. Johnson voted against approval and summarized her reasons for doing so. She said that because of the pressure of time she would not state her reasons in detail but would submit her comments in writing. She asked that they be made a part of the record.

Mr. Layman directed that her comments be included as part of the record of the meeting.

Mrs. Johnson subsequently submitted the following explanation of her negative vote on the tuition and fee schedule for the University of Oregon Law School and Graduate Education:

It is requested that this memorandum be made a part of the record of Meeting #11, Oregon State Board of Higher Education, July 23, 1973.

I would like the record to show the rationale for my negative vote in the matter of the proposed Law School tuition and fee level, because this is an issue which has been before the Board, in various forms, for at least two years and will continue to be under study by the Law School, the University of Oregon, the Board of Higher Education, and possibly, the Legislature and the Governor's Office.

In the recent past, the University of Oregon Law School, under the administration of a Dean of the Law School, has become, in many ways, almost an independent and autonomous unit. It has moved into a new building, which it does not share with the rest of the University. It has its own library, its own admission requirements, its financial aids, its registrar, a calendar based upon two semesters of study instead of the customary three academic quarters; and under this tuition proposal, a fee waiver authorization. Under separate accreditation standards, the University of Oregon Law School is compared with other Law Schools, public and private, in the Northwest and nationally. These comparisons include, but are not limited to, libraries, faculty and staffing ratios, curricula, salary levels, and planning for future developments.

At the same time, the University of Oregon Law School, under the Administration of its Dean, is a part of the University of Oregon, and as such is a part of the University's governing structure, budget, faculty and staffing plans, tuition, student incidental fees, etc.

The overall objectives of the Law School include providing accredited high quality legal education to students, presumably Oregon students predominantly. If meeting the needs of Oregon for qualified attorneys and meeting the needs of qualified Oregon students for opportunity to pursue a legal education were not among the major objectives of the University of Oregon Law School, then I would be at a loss to understand why the State should support, with general fund appropriations, a Law School at public expense.

Though I do not have before me statistics showing how many applications for admission come from Oregon students and how many from non-resident applicants; how many qualified Oregon students and how many non-resident students are denied admission, it is understood that the Law School believes a "mix" of resident and out-of-state students provide a more cosmopolitan and challenging atmosphere in which legal education is provided. In fact, the Law School has regularly admitted a number of, what it terms, outstandingly qualified non-resident students. Law students are graduate students having previously earned a degree. As graduate students, they pay the tuition and fees assigned to all graduate students,
and in Oregon, all graduate students, whether resident or out-of-state at the time of admission, pay the same amount for tuition and fees.

The Legislature has proposed, and it is present Board policy, that a non-resident tuition charge be assigned to any qualified non-resident students accepted at the University of Oregon Medical and Dental Schools, as candidates for the M.D. and D.D.S. (Other graduate students at the before-mentioned professional schools pay the same graduate tuition as graduate students elsewhere in the System. Non-resident graduate students pay the same tuition as resident graduate students.)

I have opposed the policy of no differential between resident and non-resident graduate students. I still do, even though court decisions seem to be moving in the direction of removing state barriers to what seem to be increasingly termed citizens' "rights". Tuition for out-of-state graduate students was purposely set at a lower level originally to encourage able and highly qualified graduate students to come to Oregon and to help build the reputation of Oregon's research-oriented Universities. It was believed that lower tuition levels would be an inducement to outstanding students to enroll. However, nationally, there has been an over-production of graduate students in many areas of study, and graduate programs and numbers of graduate students are being reduced or, at least, levelled off. Many qualified students, both resident and non-resident, are now finding difficulty in being admitted to graduate programs. This is true in Oregon as elsewhere.

I oppose the "no tuition differential" for non-resident Law School students for the following reasons:

1. Competition for admission to all professional schools, but especially Law, is very keen. Many liberal arts graduates, unable to find employment, or to gain admission to other areas of graduate study, are turning to Law, not necessarily with the intention of practicing, but of getting "a multi-purpose general education". Nationally, higher education is admitting and turning out too many graduates in Law.

2. Oregon State System Schools regularly are compared with nineteen other institutions (some of them in very wealthy and heavily populated states). Almost every one of the nineteen institutions charges a higher tuition for non-resident graduate students, a median being $1,408.00, in 1971-72, compared with $759.00 in Oregon.

3. Almost all the Law Schools with which the U. of O. compares itself, do likewise.

4. The State of Oregon is asked to help subsidize private schools in Oregon, and each of the two other Law Schools (Lewis and Clark College and Willamette University) charges a much higher law school tuition.

5. The U. of O. Law School compares itself with other Law Schools, generally showing its shortcomings, in relation to libraries, staffing faculty salaries, allocations for library acquisitions, etc. It does not compare itself with other Law schools in tuition charges, admissions policies, student fees, numbers of graduates passing the bar examinations, staff turn-over, tenure policies, etc. The U. of O. Law School library holdings and staffing pattern exceed those of the two Oregon private institutions.

The essential questions, it seems to me are:

1. Why does the State of Oregon support a Law School? For qualified Oregon students predominantly? To satisfy a need for highly-qualified attorneys in Oregon? What do statistics show regarding in- and out-migration of qualified students? of qualified practicing attorneys? Is there discrimination against graduates of Oregon's smaller State Colleges and in favor of graduates of more prestigious schools in admissions at the U. of O. Law School?

2. If qualified Oregon students are denied admission and supposedly more-highly-qualified non-resident graduate students are admitted to the University of Oregon Law School, what options are available to the Oregon students?

3. Oregon graduate students, including Law students, forced to enroll elsewhere must pay higher tuition. Shouldn't non-resident graduate students coming into Oregon do likewise?
4. If it is reasonable to expect non-resident undergraduates to support nearly 100% of the average cost of undergraduate education, wouldn't it make sense to require non-resident graduate students to pay at least the same dollar amount as non-resident undergraduates? Even supposing that non-resident graduate students could qualify as Oregon residents in a relatively short time, a principle is at stake here.

5. At the least, should not the increase in the Law School tuition be the same dollar amount as that for non-resident undergraduates? i.e. $49.00 per term instead of $13.00 per term?

6. By what logic did the Law School change its tuition and fee proposals every time they came to the Board's Finance Committee? The Chairman remonstrated each time, and, in the end, the proposal was hastily-drawn compromise which the Law School was protesting, up to the time of the Board's vote.

7. What are to be the criteria for the fee remissions in the Law School, under this latest version?

8. If, as repeatedly stated, the Law School accepts only the most highly-qualified students (and they are all graduates of an accredited four-year institution), why should the freshman year costs be so high, especially for so-called "orientation"?

9. The proposed Law School tuition and fee schedule, which includes an added "acceptance fee", a "Law Resources" fee and the graduated waiver and financial aids proposal, was to be on an "experimental" basis. For how long? To whom and through whom are reports and evaluations of the experimental efforts to be made? How will the Law School experience be related to other graduate programs at the University and elsewhere in the System?

(Considered by Academic Affairs Committee, June 22, 1973.)

Following an extended discussion and hearing on June 22, related to proposed changes in the Administrative Rules governing tenure, the Academic Affairs Committee directed the Board's Office to make certain modifications in the proposed rules and to forward them, as modified, to the Board with the Committee's recommendation that the Board adopt the additions to and changes in the Administrative Rules proposed in Sections AR 11.110 through AR 42.800, as presented in the July 23 revised document, Appendix A of these minutes, with the following exceptions and qualifications:

. AR 11.110 - No recommendation.

The Committee was divided in its judgment on AR 11.110. Mr. Holmes favors the present draft which leaves to the Chancellor the appointment of directors of the agencies attached to the Board's Office (Division of Continuing Education, Teaching Research, Oregon Educational and Public Broadcasting Service).

Mrs. Johnson favors modifying paragraph 1 of AR 11.110 to include among those to be appointed by the Board on the recommendation of the Chancellor, the Directors of the foregoing agencies.

Mr. Corey favors providing in paragraph 2 of AR 11.110 for the Chancellor to approve the appointment of the directors of the agencies attached to the Board's Office, on the recommendation of the appropriate Vice Chancellor.

. AR 41.010 - It is to be understood that if AR 11.110 is modified by the Board, AR 41.010 will need modification to keep it consistent with AR 11.110.

The Committee did not recommend that the Board adopt the proposed AR 42.900 as part of the Administrative Rules at this time. The Committee expressed the view that the development of institutional faculty staffing plans as proposed in the draft of AR 42.900 is essential, and the committee’s view has been communicated by the Board's Office to the institutions, which are now in process of developing such plans. The Committee wishes to await a review of these institutional plans before firming up its recommendation for Board action as to the proposed AR 42.900.
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July 23, 1973

Supplementary Proposals Provided for Consideration of Board

The Committee discussed at its June 22 meeting, but did not take formal action on possible additional changes in the Administrative Rules (a) to make tenure applicable to regular part-time faculty, (b) to provide discretionary Board review of academic non-disciplinary personnel decisions, and (c) to provide more detailed language governing faculty participation in discussions incident to changes and priorities in an institution's academic program in the light of financial exigency.

At the request of the Committee, the Board's Office provided the Board further information in respect to these three matters, presented as Appendix B of these minutes.

The Board's Office recommended approval of the first two modifications to the Administrative Rules governing tenure, Appendix B, p. 664, and Appendix B, p. 671. The Board's Office recommended that the third proposal, for modifications of the language in AR 41.320, not be approved.

Public Hearing on Proposed Changes in Administrative Rules Regarding Tenure

Testimony of Mr. Ool Polanski, OSEA. Mr. Polanski distributed to members of the Board copies of OSEA proposals for amendments, additions, and deletions to the proposal. Copies of these proposals are on file in the Board's Office. He then spoke to several that he said the Oregon State Employee's Association considered most important. Mr. Polanski said OSEA was particularly concerned that under the wording proposed in the document before the Board, institutions could transfer already employed non-tenured faculty who are on the tenure track to fixed-term contracts. These faculty have come to the institutions with the expectation that they would in due time be considered for tenure and now to change the rules so that they could be declared ineligible for tenure and be placed on fixed-term contracts would be a serious breach of faith, he said. The second matter of importance to the Oregon State Employee's Association, he said, is the change in requirements for timely notice during the second year of employment. Because faculty have great difficulty finding employment beginning in mid-year, OSEA prefers retention of the one-year notice period. Mr. Polanski concluded his presentation by saying that OSEA supports recommendations of the Board's Office to make regular part-time faculty eligible for tenure and to provide discretionary appeal of non-disciplinary personnel action. He said OSEA felt the evaluation period for part-time people should be the same as for full-time personnel.

Mr. Westerdahl questioned Mr. Polanski as to whether his concern about the fixed-term contract was for persons who would be hired in the future or for non-tenured persons already employed. He noted that the proposed rules provide that persons hired in the future would be clearly informed of the conditions of their employment. Mr. Polanski indicated he felt the proposed rules were probably satisfactory for newly hired persons, but the wording should be amended to make clear that once a person is employed on the tenure track this condition would not be changed.

Testimony of Professor Fred Decker, OSU. Professor Decker said he was appearing privately and not as a member of the Oregon State University faculty. He said Oregon members of the University Professors for Academic Order, an organization of which he is national vice-president, desir to three points in the proposed changes in the Administrative Rules:

1. The validity of due process in the evaluation procedures of the pre-tenure and post-tenure reviews, AR 41.160 and 41.170. Professor Decker said that while the proposed rules require the institutions to adopt criteria for evaluation of faculty, they do not require that these criteria be announced in advance or at the beginning of the period of service over the course of which the faculty member will be evaluated.

2. The phrase "appropriate student input" in paragraph 3, AR 41.160. The word "appropriate", he said, is ambiguous and unjustifiably alarms teaching faculty members who have already seen their civil rights come under the threat of mass, anonymous student evaluations or secret interviews of students. The rule should be amended to define the kind of student input the Board considers appropriate and to forbid practices that are inappropriate.

3. The minimum five-year probation period. Professor Decker said this provision will encourage the more able young Ph.D. graduates to eschew academic careers and seek employment in industry or government where a probationary period of one year is typical.
In response to questions from Mrs. Johnson, Professor Decker said he felt evaluation of professors should be made by their peers and superiors. If student evaluations are to be used, they should consist of discussion-type questions which stimulate a more balanced and philosophical response rather than forms designed for computer tabulation. In respect to the probationary period, Professor Decker suggested career development systems such as are used in the armed services and in some civil service positions would be preferable to the proposal being considered by the Board.

Mr. Westerdahl questioned whether the five-year probationary period would be a disincentive in obtaining talent in the System. He said he felt government employment was comparable to the tenure system, but that there were very few comparable situations at professional levels and higher in industry.

Mr. Corey asked if Professor Decker was suggesting that student evaluation be eliminated as a part of faculty review. Professor Decker said he was not asking for eliminations of student evaluation but rather an explicit definition of what was appropriate and what not. In his view, he said, student evaluation is not appropriate when the student has just completed or is currently enrolled in a course.

Comment by Mr. Chalmers, UD Law Student. Mr. Chalmers said students have an active purpose in evaluation the current offerings of any institution, and ample opportunity ought to be offered students to make recommendations both to their professors and to the departments concerned. He urged that the Board provide and maintain the language in AR 41.160 as proposed.

Board Action

The Board discussed whether it should send the document back to the Academic Affairs Committee for consideration of possible amendment in view of the testimony presented at the public hearing, act on the proposed changes item by item, or adopt the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Affairs and the Board's Office as presented, recognizing that further amendment might be desirable but that this could be accomplished at subsequent meetings when the matters at issue could be focused on specifically. Mr. Westerdahl said that he felt that the Board ought either to return the matter of tenure to the Academic Affairs Committee for further review or the Board should adopt the Administrative Rules in the form presented by the Committee. Mrs. Johnson said if the Board adopted the rules in accordance with the recommendations of the Academic Affairs Committee, the Committee would schedule an early discussion of proposals for amendment of the Administrative Rules, including an examination of the concerns expressed by Mr. Polanski. Dr. Romney emphasized that the proposals before the Board represented a firm statement of policy which had been thoroughly reviewed by a variety of interested groups both privately and in several open public hearings, and they were now being recommended to the Board by the Academic Affairs Committee for adoption.

Mr. Holmes moved that the Board adopt the proposed changes in its Administrative Rules, Sections AR 41.110 through AR 42.800, as presented in the July 23 document, amended to make regular part-time faculty eligible for tenure and to include a new section AR 41.395, as recommended by the Board's Office.

The Board adopted the proposed changes in its Administrative Rules, as presented on the following pages, by unanimous vote.
AR 11.110 Administrative Authority Over Staff and Employees

1. The chancellor shall make recommendations to the board, in which rests the sole power of decision, concerning the selection, appointment, promotion, salaries, transfers, suspensions, and terminations of appointments of the secretary to the board and the vice chancellors, and the presidents, vice presidents, and executive deans (e.g., deans of faculties, deans of administration) of the several institutions.

2. The chancellor is authorized to approve, upon recommendation of the institutional executive, the selection, appointment, promotion, salaries, transfers, suspensions and terminations of appointments of deans of schools or colleges.

3. The chancellor is authorized to approve, upon recommendation of the institutional executive (or agency head in the case of the agencies appended to the board's office), appointments, transfers, resignations, leaves of absence, changes in tenure status, promotion in rank, establishment of emeritus status, fixing of salaries, or terminations of appointments of members of the faculty and other employees of the institution and component divisions, except as provided in items 1 and 2 immediately above, or in AR 41.010; or the chancellor may delegate full responsibility for the foregoing personnel actions to the institutional executives or agency heads.

4. The chancellor is authorized to select, appoint, promote, fix the salaries and tenure status of, grant leaves to, transfer, suspend or terminate the employment of all the employees in the board's office, except as provided in item 1 immediately above, or in AR 41.010.

AR 11.210 Budget Adjustments (See also AR 12.160)

The chancellor is authorized to approve the following budget adjustments:

1. Temporary and nonrecurring transfers between requisition and salary accounts within a department.

2. Temporary and nonrecurring budget transfers between departments or divisions of an institution provided they are not used to create new permanent positions or other recurring expenses.

3. Budget additions to care for emergencies in staff, requisition accounts, or repair and maintenance items from the board's unappropriated fund or the board's emergency reserves provided no single addition may exceed $10,000, and provided these funds are not used to create new permanent positions or other recurring expenses.

A permanent record of all of the personnel adjustments and budget transfers approved by the chancellor is to be maintained in the board's budget office. Any changes in the board's unappropriated fund or board's emergency reserves resulting from budget transfers approved by the chancellor are to be included in the finance report from the board's budget office presented to board members at each regular meeting. If policy questions or unusual appointments are involved, the chancellor will consult with and secure the approval of the board. See also AR 70.180 Plant Rehabilitation.

AR 41.010 Appointment Procedures

1. The secretary of the board and vice chancellors shall be appointed by the board of higher education upon the recommendation of the chancellor. All other appointments to the board's office shall be made by the chancellor or with his approval.

Presidents shall be appointed by the board of higher education on the recommendation of the chancellor. Vice presidents and executive deans (e.g., deans of faculties, deans of administration) shall be appointed
by the board of higher education upon the conjoint recommendation of the chancellor and the president.

Deans of schools or colleges shall be appointed by the presidents, subject to approval by the chancellor.

All other members of the faculty (except for those cited immediately above), and other employees of the institutions and of the agencies appended to the board's office shall be appointed by the presidents or, in the case of the agencies attached to the board's office, by the agency heads - subject to the approval of the chancellor; or the chancellor is authorized, at his discretion, to delegate full responsibility for such appointments to the institutional executives and agency heads.

2. Appointments to classified positions in the wage budget are subject to institutional and state civil service regulations.

3. Appointments to nonsalaried academic positions are to be made in the same manner as outlined for salaried positions in paragraph 1.

4. All academic employees shall receive each year formal notification of conditions and terms of employment for the fiscal year beginning July 1 (see par. 5 below). Such notification shall be issued by the institutional executive or by the chancellor or agency heads of agencies attached to the board's office (e.g., DCE, Teaching Research, OERPS) in those instances in which the chancellor and the agency heads are the appointing officials, on a form approved by the chancellor. Unless otherwise authorized by the chancellor, appointments or reappointments are for a period not beyond the fiscal year designated in the notice of appointment.

5. The notice of appointment shall include, but not necessarily be limited to the following:
   a. Effective date of appointment.
   b. Description of position offered (including reference to any unusual duties).
   c. Academic rank and title offered.
   d. Duration of appointment.
   e. Tenure status, including the nature of any restrictions on eligibility for tenure (e.g., limited term or temporary appointments or appointments funded by grant funds beyond institutional control).
   f. Compensation offered.
   g. Other conditions of employment (e.g., AR 41.120, par. 5).

6. The faculty member shall be provided - with his initial notice of appointment, and whenever there is a significant change in the institutional expectations as to professional standards, obligations, and responsibilities to be met by faculty members, or whenever a change is made in the faculty member's status or assignment that significantly affects the institution's expectations of the faculty member - written information concerning his or her duties and responsibilities as follows:
   a. General institutional expectations as to the professional standards, obligations, and responsibilities to be met by faculty members, as set forth in the faculty handbook or similar document, including but not necessarily limited to the following:
(1) Criteria to be used in evaluating the faculty member in connection with (a) renewal of appointment, (b) promotion, (c) tenure (if faculty member is nontenured), (d) post-tenure review (if the faculty member is tenured).

(2) Procedures to be employed in the application of the evaluative criteria, including the identification of the officers responsible for (a) accumulating the information and data necessary to the evaluation, (b) making the evaluation, (c) counseling with the faculty member concerning his performance and areas of desirable improvement, and such additional information as is necessary to outline clearly the procedures to be employed.

(3) Nature and kinds of information that will be gathered by the institution as the basis for evaluating the faculty member.

(4) Extent and the nature of access the faculty member is to have to the evaluative materials accumulated by the institution with respect to him or her and the opportunity he or she will have to provide materials for inclusion in the file.

(5) The nature of the institutional staff career support program, with specific reference to the assistance the institution has available to faculty members to assist them in the improvement of their teaching and other scholarly activities.

b. Specific expectations relating to the particular position, during at least the initial period of employment, recognizing that the specific nature of assignments often changes over time.

AR 41.015 Consultative Procedures

In the exercise of the authority given the institutional executive to administer the institution over which he presides, the institutional executive shall establish written procedures through which faculty, department heads, and deans shall have the opportunity for effective participation in the deliberations leading to recommendations as to appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion of faculty. The procedures established shall provide also for the consideration of information from other appropriate sources, including, but not limited to, evaluations of faculty by students.

AR 41.105 Kinds of Appointments

Appointments authorized in the several institutions of the state system are of two kinds: (1) Fixed-term appointments, (2) Tenure-related appointments: (a) annual tenure, (b) indefinite tenure.

1. Fixed-term appointments are appointments for a specified period of time, as set forth in the notice of appointment. The faculty member thus appointed is not on the tenure track and the timely notice provisions of AR 41.310 do not apply.

Fixed-term appointments may be made and are renewable at the discretion of the institutional executive.

Fixed-term appointments are designed for use at the discretion of the institutional executive in such cases as appointment of: visiting faculty (or similar category), academic staff members whose support wholly or principally comes from gift, grant or contract funds, the cessation of which funding would eliminate the budget base for the position in question, and part-time faculty. Visiting appointments to any faculty member shall not exceed a total of seven years.
Institutional staffing plans developed under AR 42.900 shall define the characteristics, the proper use, and the appropriate limits on the use of visiting faculty or similar category.

2. Annual tenure appointments are appointments given to faculty employed .50 FTE or more whom the institution considers to be on the tenure track, in that upon the completion of an appropriate probationary period as provided in AR 41.120 they will be evaluated and considered for appointment to indefinite tenure. If the initial annual tenure appointment or successive annual tenure appointments are to be terminated otherwise than for cause or for financial exigency, timely notice as provided in AR 41.310 shall be given the faculty member.

3. Indefinite tenure appointments are appointments given selected faculty members having an appointment of .50 FTE or more by the institutional executive under authority contained in AR 11.110 and AR 41.110 in witness of the institution's formal decision that the faculty member is of such demonstrated professional competence that the institution will not henceforth terminate his employment except for: (a) cause, (b) financial exigency, or (c) program reductions, or eliminations.

"Tenured" faculty, as referred to in these Administrative Rules, are faculty who have been awarded indefinite tenure.

AR 41.110 Eligibility for Indefinite Tenure

1. Indefinite tenure may be awarded to qualified regular faculty employed on appointments of .50 FTE or more in one of the following academic ranks: senior instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor.

   When tenure is awarded to an individual on part-time status, there shall be an acknowledgement in the file of the faculty member that the tenure appointment relates only to that FTE level at which the faculty member was employed at the time tenure was granted. For the tenure appointment to take effect, the statement concerning tenure must be countersigned by the faculty member and the institutional officer duly authorized by the institutional executive to countersign such statements.

   Alteration in this initial commitment may be either by mutual consent of the faculty member and the institution or by action provided for elsewhere in the Administrative Rules relating to financial exigency or reduction or elimination of departments or programs (AR 41.320), or for cause (AR 41.325-41.390).

   Standards of performance and scholarly quality shall be the same for part-time and full-time faculty members.

   Faculty members on a full-time regular tenure appointment may, by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the institutional executive or his designated representative, be given reduced appointments of less than 1.0 FTE under terms and conditions to be mutually agreed to as stipulated in writing by the faculty member and the institutional executive or his designated representative.

2. Indefinite tenure shall be awarded to faculty of demonstrated professional competence by the institutional executive under terms and conditions set forth in AR 11.110 and AR 41.120 and in applicable institutional regulations.

3. Tenure is reaffirmed as being institutional, not systemic. Faculty having achieved tenure status in one state system institution cannot thereby claim tenure in other institutions of the state system.
Probationary years of service in one institution of the state system may be counted toward probationary service requirements in another state system institution only with the latter's explicit approval and agreement (see AR 41.120, par. 5).

AR 41.120 Initial Appointment and Probationary Service for Faculty on Tenure-Related Appointments

1. All faculty members on tenure-related appointments (41.105) of .50 FTE or more, except as provided below, shall be appointed initially on one-year appointments.

2. Awarding of tenure to regular full-time faculty, except as modified below, shall involve the assessment of the faculty member's performance each year during his probationary period (AR 42.750, par. 1b), and the assessment of his performance over not less than five consecutive years (counting the year at the end of which tenure is granted). An additional probationary year may be required by the institutional executive, following which, if the faculty member is not awarded tenure, he shall be given terminal notice, except as provided in AR 41.150.

The probationary period for regular part-time faculty employed .50 FTE or more in a tenure-related appointment (AR 41.105) shall be the same as for regular full-time faculty, cited above and in the paragraph below, except that it shall be calculated in terms of FTE years rather than calendar years.

3. Notwithstanding the above provision, the institutional executive may in special circumstances consider for tenure any probationary faculty member of the rank of assistant professor or higher, earlier than following the normal probationary period cited above when, following an evaluation of the performance of the faculty member, he finds that such an early award of tenure would be to the advantage of the institution, but in no event will the first consideration for tenure occur later than in the fifth year.

4. Faculty members given an initial appointment at the rank of full professor may be granted tenure upon appointment, at the discretion of the institutional executive. In unusual cases, and only when specifically approved by the chancellor, associate professors may be given tenure upon initial appointment.

5. At the time of initial appointment, a mutually acceptable written agreement shall be arrived at between the faculty member and the institutional executive or his designated representative, subject to delegation of authority made under AR 11.110, as to the extent to which any prior experience of the faculty member shall be credited as a part of the probationary period to be required of the faculty member before he may be considered for tenure, and the terms of the agreement shall be included in the notice of appointment.

AR 41.130 Consecutive Annual Appointments

A series of annual appointments shall be considered consecutive whether or not interrupted by one or more official leaves of absence. An official leave of absence does not count as a year of service for purposes of tenure, nor does it prejudice the staff member's rights to tenure for service actually rendered.

AR 41.140 Seventh Annual Appointment

Appointment of a full-time, regular faculty member who is on annual tenure for a seventh consecutive year shall be accompanied either by the award of tenure or by notice of termination effective at the end of the seventh year, except as provided in AR 41.150.
AR 41.145 Appointment of Regular Part-Time Faculty Beyond the FTE Equivalent of the Sixth Consecutive Year

A faculty member on a part-time tenure-related annual appointment (see AR 41.105) of .50 FTE or more, shall, in the next succeeding appointment following completion of the FTE equivalent of the sixth consecutive year, be awarded tenure or given notice of termination effective with the completion of that appointment.

AR 41.150 Exceptions

The provisions of sections AR 41.110, 41.120, 41.130, 41.140, and of the paragraph regarding timely notice (AR 41.310) shall apply to all tenure-related appointments as defined in AR 41.105 unless in individual cases there is a definite written mutual understanding to the contrary, in which case the exception will be stated in the notice of appointment.

AR 41.160 Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

1. Criteria for faculty evaluation, developed with the participation of appropriate faculty and institutional councils, shall be established in each institution:

   a. As a guide in evaluating faculty in connection with decisions as to reappointment, promotion, tenure.
   
   b. As a basis for assessing those aspects of the faculty member's performance in which improvement is desirable, whether the faculty member is tenured or non-tenured, with a view to stimulating and assisting the faculty member toward improvement through the resources available under the institution's staff career support plan.

2. The criteria shall reflect the primary functions for which the state system was established, namely:

   a. Instruction.
   
   b. Research accomplishments and other scholarly achievements, or where relevant, other creative and artistic achievement.
   
   c. Professionally-related public service, through which the institution and its members render service to the public (i.e., individuals, agencies or units of business, industry, government).
   
   d. Institutional service, which includes but is not limited to the contributions made toward departmental, school, or institutional governance, service to students through student welfare activities such as individual student advising, advising with student organizations or groups, and similar activities.

3. The criteria shall provide guidelines as to the sources and kinds of data that are appropriate as a basis for the accumulation of the information and data necessary to an effective evaluation of faculty at each of the several administrative levels (e.g., department, school, institution) at which evaluations of faculty must be made in each of the areas identified immediately above (i.e., teaching, research and scholarly activity, etc.). Specific provision shall be made for appropriate student input into the evidence accumulated as the basis for reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.

AR 41.170 Post-Tenure Review

1. Tenured faculty members shall be evaluated periodically and systematically in accordance with plans developed in the institutions, the plans to be subject to review by the chancellor and the board.
2. Institutional plans for post-tenure reviews shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:

a. A statement of the objectives of post-tenure review and evaluation of faculty.

b. A statement as to the criteria to be used in the evaluations; the nature and kinds of information and data that will be accumulated and by what means, as a basis for the evaluations.

c. A designation of those who are to make the evaluations, and with what frequency and regularity.

d. A description of the institutional plan for (1) tying the post-tenure reviews into the faculty reward system so as to provide appropriate recognition for excellence, and (2) handling firmly but humanely any situations in which a faculty member's lessened vitality and drive, or diminishing competence, are such that the resources of the faculty career support program are unable to provide the stimulation or help necessary to return the individual to a fully effective state.

AR 41.305 Resignations

Notice of resignation shall be filed in the executive office of the institution as early as possible but in no event later than one month before the resignation is to take effect. When a resignation occurs, the executive office shall notify the business office as soon as possible in order that proper accounting may be made as to inventory of property in the custody of the employee, delivery of keys, and other arrangements for termination of employment.

AR 41.310 Timely Notice

If any appointment of a full-time regular academic staff member who is on an annual tenure appointment as defined in AR 41.105 is to be terminated otherwise than for cause or financial exigency, he shall be given timely notice of termination in writing as follows: during the first annual appointment, at least three months' notice prior to the expiration of the appointment; during the second year of service, at least six months before the expiration of the appointment; thereafter, at least twelve months' notice before the expiration of the appointment.

Timely notice shall be given to part-time academic staff members on annual appointments (see AR 41.105) on the same basis as to full-time faculty members cited above, except that the length of the timely notice for part-time faculty members shall be calculated in terms of FTE years of service rather than calendar years.

AR 41.315 Terminations

Terminations can be either for cause or not for cause, as defined below. Rules regarding terminations and other sanctions (see AR 41.325) apply to all members of the academic staff, both those having indefinite tenure and those not on indefinite tenure.

AR 41.320 Termination Not for Cause

Termination not for cause is defined as any termination other than for cause as set forth in AR 41.325.

1. Staff Members with Indefinite Tenure

The appointment of an academic staff member with indefinite tenure will not be terminated for reasons other than for cause, except for (a) financial exigency, or (b) program reductions or eliminations.
Before the appointment of any academic staff member on indefinite tenure can be terminated for financial exigency, a bona fide determination will be made by the institutional executive that such financial exigency in fact does exist, and that sufficient funds are in fact not available for the payment of compensation for the position concerned. Program reductions or eliminations may be made by the institutional executive upon his determination, pursuant to institutional procedures providing for faculty and other appropriate input, that such reductions or eliminations are consistent with the goals and the needs of the institution.

Responsibility for the decision as to the existence of a state of financial exigency, and the subsequent decision as to the actions necessary to meet the financial exigency, or the decision as to the necessity for program reductions or eliminations that result in termination of employment of tenured faculty shall rest with the institutional executive. But in considering such matters, the institutional executive shall confer in a timely way with appropriate faculty and other institutional councils and with the chancellor and the board concerning the issues involved in arriving at decisions in the foregoing areas.

Institutional procedures relating to discontinuance of a program or department or reductions therein shall reflect a regard for the rights of the affected academic staff member, and such procedures may not be used as a substitute for the provisions of AR 41.330-41.390, which set forth the procedural protections to be accorded staff members.

If a tenured faculty member's appointment is terminated or if the appointment of a nontenured faculty member is terminated before the end of the period of appointment because of financial exigency, or because of the discontinuance of a program or department, the released faculty member's place will not be filled by a replacement within a period of two years, unless the released faculty member has been offered reappointment and a reasonable time within which to accept or decline it.

If the staff member cannot be retained either in the position in which presently employed or in some alternate position, maximum possible notice of termination shall be provided the academic staff member being terminated for financial exigency, and in the case of faculty terminated because of program reductions or eliminations not demonstrably related to a state of financial exigency, twelve months' notice shall be given.

2. Staff Members Without Indefinite Tenure

Appropriate notice of termination shall be provided staff members holding annual tenure appointments (AR 41.105) as set forth in paragraph 41.310 of the Administrative Rules. If the employment of such staff member is being terminated for financial exigency so as to render impossible the provision of notice as set forth in AR 41.310, maximum notice possible will be provided.

AR 41.325 Termination and Other Sanctions for Cause

The appointment of an academic staff member, whether or not having tenure, may be terminated, or other sanctions may be imposed, for cause. Sanctions for cause include oral or written warning or reprimand, written censure, removal from an assigned post and reassignment, suspension for a period not to exceed one year, and termination. Sanctions more severe than oral or written warning or reprimand shall be imposed in accordance with the procedure in paragraphs 41.330 through 41.390 of these Administrative Rules. Sanctions of oral or written warning or reprimand may be imposed in accordance with institutional procedures.
Definition of Cause

"Cause" shall mean: (1) conviction of a felony or of a crime involving moral turpitude during period of employment by the Department of Higher Education (or prior thereto if the conviction was willfully concealed in applying to the Department for employment); (2) conduct proscribed by section 42,410 of these Rules; or (3) failure to perform the responsibilities of an academic staff member, arising out of his particular assignment, toward his students, toward his academic discipline, toward his colleagues, or toward the institution in its primary educational and scholarly functions and secondary administrative functions of maintaining property, disbursing funds, keeping records, providing living accommodations and other services, sponsoring activities, and protecting the health and safety of persons in the institutional community. Evidence to demonstrate cause under the standard set forth in item (3) of this definition of "cause" may include, but is not limited to, evidence of incompetence, gross inefficiency, default of academic integrity in teaching, research, or scholarship, intentional or habitual neglect of duty, and failure to perform adequately for medical reasons.

Initiation of Formal Proceedings

If the institutional executive, after exploring to his satisfaction the possibilities of a mutual settlement, determines that there is probable cause to impose a sanction or sanctions more severe than oral or written warning or reprimand upon an academic staff member, he shall authorize the preparation of formal charges in accordance with institutional procedure. The charges shall specifically state the facts believed to constitute the grounds for the imposition of a sanction or sanctions. Following the authorization of preparation of the charges, no institutional officer responsible for evaluating the charges shall participate in their preparation. Within 10 days after the authorization of preparation of the charges, they shall be filed with the institutional executive, and a copy personally delivered, or sent by certified mail, to the academic staff member.

Temporary Suspension of Academic Staff Member

If at any time during the pendency of the charges against the academic staff member the institutional executive makes a finding that there is a clear and present danger that the academic staff member's continued performance of his duties will be harmful to the institution, to the academic staff member, or to the public at large, the institutional executive may suspend the academic staff member, without financial penalty, from some or all of his duties.

Academic Staff Member's Request for a Formal Hearing

Within 10 days after the personal delivery or mailing of a copy of the charges to the academic staff member, the academic staff member who is so charged shall state in writing to the institutional executive whether he desires a formal hearing on the charges. This 10-day period may be reasonably extended by the institutional executive. If the academic staff member requests in writing that he not have a formal hearing, the institutional executive may impose an appropriate sanction or sanctions upon the academic staff member to be effective as determined by the institutional executive, who shall promptly give written notice thereof to the academic staff member; provided, however, that the appointment of an academic staff member shall not be terminated except as provided in AR 41.370.

Hearing Committee

Unless the academic staff member requests in writing that he not have a formal hearing on the charges, such hearing shall be before a special ad hoc committee of from three to five members. Committee members shall
be selected in the following manner: the advisory council, faculty senate, or other proper elective faculty body shall appoint one or more permanent panels each consisting of ten faculty members; from one, or if necessary, two, of the permanent panels, the same elective body will name from three to five to serve as the hearing committee. The academic staff member and the administration are each allowed one peremptory challenge; a committee member so challenged will then be replaced from the same panel or panels of ten each by the elective body initially charged with impaneling. The committee shall be constituted promptly and shall complete the hearing and its report within 30 days of its constitution, if possible. The hearing committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

AR 41.355 Conduct of Hearing

The committee shall set a date for the hearing, giving sufficient time to the academic staff member to prepare his case. The academic staff member and the administration shall have the option of assistance by counsel, both in preparing for and at the hearing. Not less than one week before the hearing date, the academic staff member shall file with the committee any such written statement of his case as he elects to file. The committee shall review the charges and the academic staff member's statement, if any, prior to the hearing. During the period between the filing of the charges and the institutional executive's action on the committee's report, the academic staff member shall enjoy the same academic freedom as other members of the faculty, unless suspended as provided in 41.340 of these Administrative Rules.

If the academic staff member has neither requested in writing that he have a formal hearing nor requested in writing that he not have a formal hearing, the committee shall consider the case on the basis of the obtainable information and decide what, if any, sanction or sanctions it will recommend be imposed upon the academic staff member.

The academic staff member shall have the option of a public or private hearing except that the committee, for cause, may require that the hearing be limited to a few observers, including representatives of the press. The conduct of the hearing shall be under the control of the committee chairman, subject to the procedure of the committee.

A verbatim record of the hearing shall be kept. At the hearing, the testimony of witnesses, upon oath or affirmation, and other evidence concerning any disputed facts shall be received by the committee. The administration shall have the burden of proving its formal charges against the academic staff member and the committee findings shall be according to the preponderance of the evidence.

The committee shall not be strictly bound to follow court procedures or rules of evidence, except as otherwise required by law. The academic staff member shall have the right to appear, and to participate in the hearing and to present relevant evidence to the committee and he may be represented by counsel with or without the presence of the academic staff member. The academic staff member and the administration shall have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. The administration will, insofar as possible, secure the cooperation, for attendance at the hearing, of witnesses requested by the academic staff member. The academic staff member and the administration shall be given a reasonable opportunity to submit rebuttal testimony or other evidence. At the conclusion of the testimony, the committee may permit each side to make an oral or written summation; if this privilege is extended to one side, it must be extended to both. When the committee is satisfied that all pertinent and available evidence has been received, and that such summations as it deems appropriate have been presented, the hearing will be adjourned. The committee will then go into executive session for the purpose of deliberation.
AR 41.360 Committee's Report

The committee, by agreement of at least a majority of the members thereof, shall make explicit findings based upon the hearing record with respect to each specification in the formal charges lodged against the academic staff member, and shall within 10 days following determination by the committee of its findings recommend, by agreement of at least a majority of the members thereof, what, if any, sanction or sanctions be imposed upon the academic staff member. The institutional executive and the academic staff member shall be given copies of the findings and recommendation. The verbatim record of the hearing shall be made available to the institutional executive and to the academic staff member for copying, or copies thereof shall be made for them at cost upon their request.

AR 41.365 Action by the Institutional Executive

The institutional executive may, if he deems it necessary, refer the matter back to the committee for further findings of fact. The institutional executive shall, promptly after receipt of the committee's report and after having had a reasonable opportunity to consult with the chancellor and others, give the academic staff member and the chancellor written notice of his decision and of his reasons therefor if his decision is to impose a sanction or sanctions upon an academic staff member, when it is to be effective; provided, however, that the appointment of an academic staff member shall not be terminated except as provided in AR 41.370.

AR 41.370 Date of Termination

If the appointment of an academic staff member is to be terminated according to the procedure in AR 41.345, the appointment shall not be terminated sooner than one month nor later than one year from the end of the 10-day period (or as it may have been extended), provided, however, that an academic staff member having indefinite tenure whose appointment is terminated for cause other than misconduct shall receive his salary for one year from the end of the 10-day period, or as it may have been extended.

If the appointment of an academic staff member is to be terminated according to the procedure in AR 41.365, the appointment shall not be terminated sooner than one month nor later than one year from the date of the written notice, and provided that an academic staff member having indefinite tenure whose appointment is terminated for cause other than misconduct shall receive his salary for one year from the date of the written notice.

AR 41.375 Review by the Board

The board shall review any case of the imposition of a sanction or sanctions upon an academic staff member having indefinite tenure upon written notice of appeal by the academic staff member. This appeal shall be filed with the board's secretary within 10 days (or within such extension of time as permitted for cause by the chancellor) of the date of the written notice of the institutional executive's decision, stating grounds for the appeal, with a copy to the institutional executive. The board may on its own initiative review any case involving the question of the imposition of a sanction or sanctions upon an academic staff member. Upon receiving a notice of any written notice of appeal by an academic staff member having indefinite tenure or of the board's decision to review a case, the institutional executive shall forward to the board's secretary the following: a copy of the charges in the case and of the academic staff member's written statement, if any, in answer thereto; the verbatim record of the hearing, and any exhibits; the committee's findings and recommendations; and a copy of the notice of the institutional executive's decision.
The board may: review the case on the record only; return the case to the institution from which it came for the receipt of further evidence or testimony; conduct such hearings as it deems proper for its review; refer the matter to a committee of board members for consideration, including possible hearings, and recommendations; or refer the matter to a hearing officer for hearings and recommendation. The board shall make such determination of the case, pursuant to this code, as it deems just.

If the board sustains the decision to impose a sanction or sanctions upon the academic staff member, the sanction or sanctions shall be effective at the date originally named by the institutional executive, or such later date as determined by the board.

AR 41.380 Board's Initiative in Bringing Investigation or Charges

On any occasion when it appears to the board that there is probable cause to impose a sanction or sanctions upon an academic staff member, the board may direct the institutional executive to determine whether he finds there is probable cause to impose a sanction or sanctions upon the academic staff member. If the finding of the institutional executive is that there is probable cause to impose a sanction or sanctions upon the academic staff member, the institutional executive shall transmit such report to the board, including a full statement of his reasons for such a finding. If the board, after receipt of the report, deems that the facts of the case warrant the filing of formal charges, the board shall provide the institutional executive with a statement explaining its exceptions to his findings and it may direct the institutional executive to have formal charges prepared or, upon the request of the institutional executive, the board may direct some person within the department of higher education to prepare the formal charges. The subsequent procedure shall be the same as if charges were initially authorized to be prepared by the institutional executive.

AR 41.385 No Reprisals

No employee of the Department of Higher Education shall be subject to reprimand or other adverse action by the Department for appearing as a witness or for participating as a member of a committee in any of the proceedings provided for in this section 41.300.

AR 41.390 Personnel Record

No notation shall be made in the personnel record of an academic staff member of any investigation which has not resulted in formal charges being brought against him under paragraphs 41.325 through 41.380 or which has not resulted in the imposition of a sanction of oral or written warning or reprimand in accordance with institutional procedures, as provided in paragraph 41.325 of these Administrative Rules.

AR 41.395 Discretionary Review of Academic Non-disciplinary Personnel Decisions

An academic staff member aggrieved by a non-disciplinary personnel decision by an institutional executive may appeal such decision as follows:

1. Any request for review by the board or the board's office shall be made only after the academic staff member has exhausted all internal institutional procedures appropriate for reviewing the decision in question.

2. All requests for review shall be in writing, shall be addressed to the chancellor, and shall state succinctly the basis of the grievance and the reasons of academic policy which justify further review of the decision of the institutional executive.
3. Any decision to take further action with respect to an alleged grievance shall be discretionary with the board.

4. Any such requests for review shall be assigned to the chancellor or his designated representative for examination, informal settlement if possible, conduct of a conference or hearing, if necessary, and report and recommendation to the board if the grievance is not resolved.

5. The consideration of any such request shall be limited to appellate review of alleged errors by the appointing authority with respect to procedure, adherence to the Administrative Rules or other applicable law, and fair consideration of the facts. The scope of review shall not include a de novo review on the merits of the institutional executive's delegated discretion.

AR 42.840 Staff Career Support Program

1. A staff career support plan shall be developed and maintained by each institution, through institutional procedures which provide for input from appropriate faculty and institutional councils, the plans to be subject to review by the chancellor and the board.

2. The institutional plans shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:

   a. A statement of the objectives of the plan.

   b. A statement as to the extent of the institutional commitment to supportive programs for staff development.

   c. A specific delegation of authority, responsibility, and duties to the following key administrators and faculty groups for the implementation of the staff career support plan: vice presidents for academic affairs or deans of faculties, deans of schools or colleges, chairman of academic departments, faculty advisory committees or councils, individual faculty members.

   d. A delineation of the specific elements of the planned staff career support program for:

      (1) Beginning faculty members.

      (2) Faculty members in mid-career.

      (3) Faculty members in late-career.

   e. A statement as to the nature of the planned periodic institutional evaluation of the proposed plan as the program upon which it is based moves along.

   f. A statement as to the way in which the institution’s faculty reward system is keyed to the staff career support plan.
Implementation of Recommendations of Joint Library Study

The Committee on Academic Affairs considered a report by Dr. Carl W. Hintz, Dean of Library Services, on the status of selected recommendations of the joint library study, a study carried out during 1971-72 at the request of the Joint boards by a committee representing public educational libraries.

Dr. Hintz's report, titled The Joint Library Study - A Status Report as to Selected Aspects of the Recommendations, is bound in a separate volume and is considered an integral part of these minutes.

Because he had to leave the meeting early, Mr. Mosser asked to make a statement before leaving. He stated that he agreed that extension of LOLITA to the other campuses of the State System should proceed. He observed that there might be some questions concerning the development of centralized storage of low-utilization library materials as discussed in the joint library report, but he felt it is important that it be understood there is a limit to the extent to which the state can continue to provide the relatively high-cost storage of library materials necessary to house the library acquisitions as they continue their necessary expansion. He said that he felt that study of the patterns of utilization aimed at discovering which the low-utilization materials are should go forward in the libraries in a vigorous fashion so that if it becomes necessary to consider centralized storage of low-utilization materials, we shall have the facts in terms of which to assess the nature of the problem.

In summarizing his report, Dr. Hintz said the growth of libraries is a national phenomenon. Libraries do not develop in a vacuum, he pointed out, but exist to serve the needs of educational programs and scholarship generally. Duplication of library resources at the undergraduate level particularly is necessary, he said, if programs are duplicated. It is unrealistic to think an undergraduate program can be taught successfully without supporting library resources. Duplication of library resources serving graduate needs is less common because there is less often duplication of programs at the graduate level at which level institutions tend to specialize.

The point of control of duplication of materials, he observed, is at the point of acquisition. Two principal recommendations of the joint library study - the extension of LOLITA and the completion of the union list of serials - will provide tools essential to control of unnecessary duplication, he said. However, implementation of these recommendations is dependent on provision of funding.

Mr. Westerdahl commented that the point made by Mr. Mosser had not been that library holdings should not grow, but that there was a limitation on on-campus library housing that could be provided these holdings.

Dr. Romney reviewed the history of the joint library study. He said that the Governor's budget recommended funding for the extension of LOLITA to additional campuses, and that this matter will be considered in the 1974 legislative session when the legislature considers proposals for the Oregon State System of Higher Education computer network. No additional outside funds are expected for extension of the union list of serials, but efforts will be made to allocate some funds for this work from within the System. He noted that the community colleges have identified the completion of the union list of serials as the project they would like to see completed first among all of the projects proposed in the joint library study.

Dr. Hintz reported that it was the view of the library council of the State System that the central office commitment in terms of unclassified personnel ought to be increased from 1.12 to 2.00 FTE. He said that it was the feeling of the State System librarians that the Dean of Library Services ought to be a full-time central staff officer rather than one of the institutional head libraries assigned .12 FTE to his duties as Dean of Library Services for the State System. Dr. Romney observed that the recommendation of the library council had been considered in the Board's Office and that some consideration was being given to the possible realignment of the present 1.12 FTE unclassified personnel assigned to coordination of library development. Chancellor Lieuallen observed that with resources limited, there were other personnel needs in the central office that he considered to have greater priority than the increase from 1.12 to 2.00 FTE in the library field.

Mrs. Johnson emphasized the need for maximum possible coordination among libraries - all libraries, not just State System libraries. Some members of the Committee expressed the hope that every effort would be made within the resources that could be made available, to assure the fullest possible coordination of library development with a view to encouraging the sharing of resources and the avoidance of unnecessary duplication of resources.
Mr. Holmes said he felt assignment of responsibility for library coordination to a position, either part-time or full-time, located in the Board's Office would be an important step in achieving maximum coordination of library resources. He suggested that further consideration be given to this matter. Mr. Corey agreed, saying that the present meeting was not perhaps an appropriate time to consider priorities for assignments in the Board's Office, but that when such priorities are being considered attention should be given to possible additional needs for library coordination.

Following Dean Hintz's presentation, President Clark, President MacVicar, and Dr. Romney spoke of the very considerable contribution that Dean Hintz had made to the development of higher education in Oregon during a career of 25 years in the State System as Director of Libraries at the University of Oregon, during eight years of which he was also Dean of Library Services for the State System of Higher Education. Reference was made to Dean Hintz's leadership not alone in the State System, but regionally, nationally, and internationally. It was observed that during his almost 40 years in the field of librarianship he had held almost every position of leadership in the state, regional and national library associations and that several foreign nations had employed him as consultant on their library problems.

Mrs. Johnson and other members of the Board expressed the appreciation of the Board for Dean Hintz's outstanding service and asked that a resolution to that effect be drafted for Board adoption at the July meeting of the Board.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the Dean of Library Services, as stated below, and recommended that they be adopted by the Board.

1. That LOLITA be extended to all Oregon State System of Higher Education libraries.

2. That the study of the extent of low-utilization materials in State System libraries be continued.

3. That use of low cost semi-storage locally of low-utilization materials be considered before moving toward central storage of these materials.

4. That the union list of serials be funded and brought to completion without delay.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Joss asked what the union list of serials is. Dr. Romney explained that this list, when completed, will provide information concerning all the serial publications, e.g., magazines, year books, annual or biennial reports, held by the institutional libraries. From January 1970 to July 1972, approximately $28,000 in federal funds and about $40,000 in staff time was devoted to the development of the union list of serials, Dr. Romney said. The project is moving ahead with a present allocation of about $8,000 in state funds, plus such staff time as can be given to it. As indicated earlier, the community colleges have identified completion of the list as the coordination project having first priority insofar as their interests are concerned.

Mrs. Johnson moved that the Board adopt the recommendations of the Dean of Library Services as indicated in the Academic Affairs Committee recommendation. She further moved that a fifth point be added to the recommendation, namely, that when personnel needs of the central offices are next considered by the Board, consideration be given to need for a central staff position for library coordination.

The Board approved the recommendation with the fifth point as proposed.
Resolution Honoring C. W. Hintz

At the request of the Committee on Academic Affairs, the following resolution was prepared for consideration by the Board at its meeting on July 23, 1973:

RESOLUTION OF THE OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION ON THE 23rd DAY OF JULY, 1973, HONORING CARL W. HINTZ, DEAN OF LIBRARY SERVICES FOR THE STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN, UO

WHEREAS, Carl W. Hintz has served as University Librarian of the University of Oregon for twenty-five years;

WHEREAS, he has served additionally as Dean of Library Services for the State System of Higher Education since 1965;

WHEREAS, during his professional career he has attained a pronounced leadership role throughout the state and the nation in fields of library services, and library education;

WHEREAS, he has been honored as Chairman of the American Library Association Commission on National Planning for Library Education, as President of the American Library Association, Library Education Division, as President of the Pacific Northwest Library Association, as President of the Oregon Library Association, and other prestigious professional association leadership roles;

WHEREAS, his energetic efforts as Dean of Library Services has had a most noteworthy beneficial influence on services to students, faculty and the public generally in State System and other libraries in Oregon; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board of Higher Education formally express its gratitude to Dr. Hintz for his dedicated service to the State of Oregon, and acknowledge his outstanding contributions to higher education; and, further,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board, upon the occasion of Dr. Hintz's retirement, collectively and individually wish him and Mrs. Hintz abundant success, health and happiness in the future.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board adopted the resolution as presented.

1973-74 Tuition

(Considered by Finance Committee June 26 and July 13, 1973; revised report as presented to Board on July 23, 1973, appears below.)

Staff Report to the Committee

The 1973-1975 legislative appropriation act for the "Education and General Program" of the Department of Higher Education establishes an expenditure limitation of $219,082,653. The Education and General Program includes the colleges and universities, Oregon Technical Institute, the University of Oregon Medical School, the University of Oregon Dental School, Teaching Research, Educational and Public Broadcasting, and Centralized Activities.

The expenditure limitation includes a General Fund appropriation of $153,868,776. This is a $4,390,934 reduction of the Governor's recommendation but it is more than offset by an increase in authorized expenditures from "other funds" (chiefly tuition). The "other funds" amount is $65,213,877, which is $5,133,970 more than the $60,079,907 recommended by the Governor.

The basic assumptions on which this staff report and recommendations are based are:

1. That the Governor recommended and the Legislative Assembly authorized expenditures at a level substantially below that incorporated in the budget proposed by the Board.

2. In acting on the budget, the Ways and Means Subcommittee deliberately restored for 1973-1974 the approximate funding "mix" that was in effect in 1971-1973, thus suggesting the freedom of the Board to increase tuition and fees to fund the level of authorized expenditure.

3. In approving program levels for the four-year institutions in 1973-74, and 1974-75, (see pp. 5 and 6 of the Ways and Means Committee budget report) there was an 8 percent increase in General Fund support for 1973-74 and 6 percent for 1974-75. The resulting "mix," as shown, calls for a larger increase in "other funds" support.
in 1973-74 and a smaller increase in 1974-75 (a decrease for OTI). Because the subcommittee indicated the "mix" in its displays of the cost per student, it might be concluded that the tuition increases for 1973-74 should be relatively large and those for 1974-75 should be comparatively small. However, neither the budget report nor the appropriation act would preclude a more equal division of the tuition increases.

4. That Federal regulations will permit the proposed increases.

The Colleges and Universities

For 1973-74, the total budget for these six institutions is presently estimated to be $86,730,895. It is expected that, of this total $23,467,548 should come from tuition sources. This is an increase of $2,192,168 over the $21,275,380 that would be produced by continuing 1972-73 tuition rates in 1973-74. In arriving at the estimates, notice has been taken of the fact of passage of House Bill 2787, which authorizes scholarships to international students (administered by the Scholarship Commission) in amounts not to exceed 10 percent of the tuition and fees paid by all nonresidents ($7+ million per year). This program reinstatement is apparently preferable to the recently adopted policy of the Board to classify more than 600 international students as residents for tuition purposes. Because of the greater flexibility of the program under HB 2787, it is presumed that the Board will wish to utilize the new statute to limit the dollars involved to $350,000 in 1973-74. These scholarships will be treated as a reduction of income rather than as an expense.

It is assumed that the presence of international students is for the primary benefit of resident undergraduates. It is hoped that the policy will retard the decline of the number of international students at the universities and perhaps to increase slightly the number of international students at the colleges and Oregon Technical Institute.

At the Finance Committee meeting on June 26, it was suggested that consideration be given to assessing different rates of tuition to lower division and upper division students. Such a policy would set lower division tuition in relation to the estimated cost of lower division instruction ($1,415) and upper division tuition in relation to upper division cost ($1,769). The average cost of undergraduate instruction is estimated at $1,589. Applying such a policy would tend to bring lower division tuition rates closer to the levels charged by community colleges.

The application of this policy in 1973-74 would result in decreases for lower division students of $3 per term for resident students and $9 per term for nonresidents. Upper division residents would have a $28 or $29 increase and nonresidents an increase of $109 per term. In view of the magnitude of the upper division increases, it would appear to be desirable to defer adoption of such a change until 1974-75.

Shown below are four tables which appeared in the October 1972 report on tuition alternatives. The tables indicate the level of annual fees in 1972-73 at the community, private, and state colleges in Oregon and the 1971-72 rate in 15 other states. We are still seeking an appropriate display of costs-per-student at state institutions of other states and will endeavor to have these by the time of the Committee meeting.

Table 1

Academic-Year Fees at Oregon Community Colleges, 1972-73

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>District Residents</th>
<th>Other Oregon Residents</th>
<th>Non-Oregon Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountain</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>$810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Oregon</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemekota</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clatsop</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn-Benton</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hood</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>256.50</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Oregon</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Valley</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umpqua</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median fee</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>$486</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**Academic-Year Fees at Oregon Private Colleges, 1972-73**

(Schools with Fall Enrollment over 200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewis and Clark College</td>
<td>$2,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Portland</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette University</td>
<td>1,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed College</td>
<td>2,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific University</td>
<td>1,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linfield College</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylhurst College</td>
<td>1,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner Pacific College</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fox College</td>
<td>1,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Christian College</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Angel College</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Christian College</td>
<td>1,665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median fee: $1,727

### Table 3

**Academic-Year Fees at Oregon Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities, 1972-73**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Resident Undergraduate</th>
<th>Non-Resident Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$508.50</td>
<td>$1,567.50</td>
<td>$754.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>505.50</td>
<td>1,564.50</td>
<td>751.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>516.00</td>
<td>1,575.00</td>
<td>762.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>513.00</td>
<td>1,233.00</td>
<td>759.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>513.00</td>
<td>1,233.00</td>
<td>759.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDC</td>
<td>519.00</td>
<td>1,239.00</td>
<td>765.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTI</td>
<td>522.00</td>
<td>1,581.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median fee: $513.00

* Including Building, Health, and Incidental Fees

### Table 4

**Comparative Fees, 1971-72**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>State College Median</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>University Median</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Nonresident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$163</td>
<td>$-437</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$1,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>-192</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>1,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>-118</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>1,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>-144</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>-169</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>1,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>1,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>-69</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>-77</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>2,152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 State Median: $522

| Oregon | $501 | $507 | $+6 | $1,538 | $661 | $661 |

---

July 23, 1973
The basic building blocks of a tuition plan for the colleges and universities for 1973-74 include the following data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Annual Tuition</th>
<th>Tuition Cost</th>
<th>Category of Student</th>
<th>Number of Students 1973-74</th>
<th>Number of Students 1974-75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 384</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>Resident undergraduate</td>
<td>33,005</td>
<td>33,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>23.98%</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>4,757</td>
<td>4,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Nonresident undergraduate</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>4,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>76.51%</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Special (PSU)</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>3,333</td>
<td>3,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuition collections needed: $51,057,968

The precise division of tuition collections between the two fiscal years is adjustable to bring in greater or lesser amounts the first year and adjusting second-year tuition rates reciprocally.

The basic assumption in the agenda item, as originally prepared for the July 13 meeting, was to achieve approximately equal increases in the two years of the 1973-1975 biennium. Further analysis, however, has stressed the facts that in 1974-75, nonresident undergraduate enrollment is expected to decline (by 175 students) and the rate of collection from nonresidents will increase by only $21 per term (compared to $49 per term increase in 1973-74). This places a larger burden of increase on graduate and resident undergraduate students in 1974-75, unless there are other changes in policy or the recommendations for 1973-74.

If the 1973-74 recommendations, as presented in the agenda item for July 13, were adopted—and assuming enrollment and other income assumptions hold—the increases in 1974-75 for resident undergraduates and graduate students would need to be on the order of $9 and $16 per term, respectively.

It, therefore, seems preferable to modify the agenda recommendations for 1973-74 by increasing the per term increases for graduate and resident undergraduate students by $1 (from $12 to $13 and from $7 to $8) and modify the other recommendations proportionally. Corresponding increases in 1974-75 would balance the "other funds" requirements of the 1973-1975 budget for the colleges and universities.

The budgeted "Other Funds" requirement

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Less carry forward} & \quad -400,000 \\
\text{Less collection of fees other than tuition} & \quad -2,045,400 \\
\text{*Plus international student fee remissions} & \quad +1,050,000 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Total tuition collections required: $51,057,968

*The potential cost of such fee remissions could equal $1,142,571.

Applying the foregoing facts and assumptions would result in the following expectations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1972-73 Rates</th>
<th>Student Categories</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
<th>1974-75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 384</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>33,005</td>
<td>31,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>4,757</td>
<td>4,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>7,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>3,333</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total tuition collections: $51,140,712
Oregon Technical Institute

The average cost of instruction at Oregon Technical Institute is budgeted at $2,322 per student. It has been Board policy to charge Oregon Technical Institute students the resident and nonresident undergraduate tuition rates charged at the universities. No change in this policy seems to be required at this time.

University of Oregon Medical School
University of Oregon Dental School

It is traditional and logical to charge medical technician and dental hygiene students at rates applicable to undergraduates at the four-year institutions.

Students of medicine and dentistry have been charged $247 per term for residents, $436 per term for nonresident students enrolled in 1971-72, and $600 per term for nonresident students enrolled in 1972-73. Graduate students in basic science or nursing have paid the regular graduate rate ($210 per term).

It is reasonable that tuition for all students at the Medical and Dental Schools be increased in proportion to the increases at the other institutions.

Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that, following public hearing at the July 23, 1973, Board meeting, the following tuition-related actions be taken:

1. That the Board authorize participation in 1973-74 in the program of scholarships for international students authorized by House Bill 2787, of the 1973 Legislative Assembly, to the extent of approximately five percent of the tuition and fees paid by all nonresident students.

2. That tuition rates per term in 1973-74 be set as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For the colleges and universities</th>
<th>Per Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident undergraduates</td>
<td>$136 (an $8 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident undergraduates</td>
<td>417 (a $49 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>530 (a $49 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>223 (a $13 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>334 (per semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Law School</td>
<td>21 (a $2 to $7 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special students (FSU)</td>
<td>71 (a $4 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates (per credit hour)</td>
<td>92 (a $5 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 credit hours</td>
<td>114 (a $7 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 credit hours</td>
<td>138 (an $8 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 credit hours</td>
<td>163 (a $10 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 credit hours</td>
<td>187 (an $11 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 credit hours</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 credit hours</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Oregon Technical Institute</th>
<th>Per Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident undergraduates</td>
<td>136 (an $8 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident undergraduates</td>
<td>530 (a $49 increase)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For University of Oregon Medical School</th>
<th>Per Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>262 (a $15 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>136 (an $8 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing; medical technician</td>
<td>463 (a $27 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident</td>
<td>637 (a $37 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>417 (a $49 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in 1971-72</td>
<td>223 (a $13 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing; medical technician</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For University of Oregon Dental School</th>
<th>Per Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>262 (a $15 increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>136 (an $8 increase)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Nonresident Dentistry
Enrolled in 1971-72 463 (a $27 increase)
Other 637 (a $37 increase)
Dental hygiene 427 (a $49 increase)
Graduate 223 (a $13 increase)

3. That the Division of Continuing Education be authorized to establish for credit courses such rates of tuition, not to exceed $21 per undergraduate credit hour or $35.50 per graduate credit hour, as will facilitate the Division's efforts to operate on a self-sustaining basis.

Discussion and Recommendation of the Committee

Mr. Sheridan Long, a graduate of Portland State University reported returning for further undergraduate courses in preparation for attendance as a graduate student at another institution. He suggested that the requirement that he pay graduate fees was inequitable.

Mrs. Johnson noted that a significant policy question was posed by the issue of the ultimate obligation of the State of Oregon to subsidize undergraduate courses.

In the discussion of the modification of the international student program, it was emphasized that the program should be administered on a system-wide, coordinated basis, with quotas appropriately allocated to the several institutions.

There was extended discussion of the philosophical or rational justification of setting tuition as a percentage of the cost of instruction.

Mr. Mosser inquired about the retention rate used in forecasting tuition collections and was informed that the rates represented long-term trends rather than the very favorable rate of 1972-73. If the 1972-73 rate were to recur in 1973-74, lower tuition increases might be justified in 1974-75.

Mr. Richard Blanche, student body president at Oregon College of Education, presented his concern that the Board should avoid arbitrary decisions, recognizing the societal benefits of higher education and minimizing the effect of pricing students out of the education market. He urged further appeal to the Legislature.

President Wolfe urged a study, looking to 1974-75, relating to the "special student" tuition at Portland State University.

President Clark suggested the alternative of tuition increases in 1973-74 large enough to obviate the need for tuition increases in 1974-75.

Mr. Steve Lamb, chairman of the Senate of the Associated Students at Oregon College of Education, expressed his concern over the impact on enrollment of the proposed tuition increases.

The Committee recommended Board approval of the staff recommendations, following public hearing at the July 23 meeting of the Board.

Board Discussion and Action

President Layman indicated that presentations in connection with the public hearing on tuition for 1973-74 were in order. He recognized Mrs. Linda Stevenson of Ashland who spoke on behalf of the Ashland and Medford branches of the American Association of University Women and also for the Ashland Branch of the Business and Professional Women.

Mrs. Stevenson asked that the Board consider equalizing tuition for undergraduate courses at Southern Oregon College because the present prices are unfair and discriminate against those holding a bachelor's degree. She said there is a substantial difference in the amount paid for the same undergraduate course by an individual with a degree and a person who does not have a bachelor's degree. She urged the Board to adopt a policy of uniform undergraduate payment for uniform undergraduate courses. She said there is a potential of at least 100 people in the Ashland area who would take undergraduate courses if the fees were equalized.

Mr. Layman said the Board members had received a resolution from the organization to this effect and the point had been noted in considering tuition.
Mr. Joss asked whether it would be possible to permit a person holding a degree to take a specified number of hours at the undergraduate rate. Mr. Holmer said this would be feasible but the cost of instruction at either the graduate or undergraduate level represented only a fraction of the cost of instruction. If undergraduate tuition were extended to those holding a degree, these students would be subsidized from the general fund. This would probably result in a minor increase in the undergraduate tuition to be charged to everyone.

Miss Sarah Mayea, Assistant Professor of English at Southern Oregon College, said students having access to a community college could take undergraduate courses at a lower rate. If the undergraduate tuition rate were granted for these undergraduate courses, it would improve the competitive position of Southern Oregon College.

Mr. Greg Leo, President of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon, said he opposed the spiralling trend of automatically raising the cost of tuition as a means of closing the gap between funds required and the state appropriation for the support of the institutions. He said this is not a sound fiscal policy and may result in the loss of students to the lower-cost community colleges. He asked the Board to examine other means of generating income rather than relying on an automatic increase in tuition and to stop or slow down the spiralling cost of education.

Board members stated they were very concerned with any tuition increase but that few alternatives were available.

Mr. John Nickelson read a statement prepared by Mr. John Struder, Oregon Chairman of the Socialist Workers Party, which opposed the tuition increases on the basis that added costs will force many students to leave school. He said the Young Socialist Alliance and the Socialist Workers Party demand that there be no tuition increases. Mr. Struder said it is the responsibility of government to guarantee an education to everyone who wishes it, regardless of whether the individual student can afford it. He said it is society's responsibility to assure that everyone who wishes to go to school can do so for as long as he wishes without having to be burdened with paying tuition or other living expenses.

Mr. Ralph LaVelle Blondell, graduate student in sociology at Portland State University, said the percentage of the costs of instruction a student pays varies according to the number of hours he takes under the present tuition and fee structure. Part-time students are penalized for not attending full-time. He said he would suggest that the Board establish tuition and fees on a per-credit-hour basis, so that all students would be paying the same percentage of the cost of instruction for each credit hour taken.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the Board considered the recommendations for tuition and fees as presented.

Mr. Joss asked whether the recommendations included any provisions for part-time students, other than the special students category at Portland State University.

Mr. Holmer said it is recognized that there needs to be a thorough review and revision of the arrangement for special students both with respect to tuition and to fees. He said there is justification for the comments made by the students, but so far it has not been possible to devise a logical and workable solution for recommendation to the Board. He said the recommendations recommended by the Finance Committee should be approved, but the quest for a different treatment of part-time students should continue.

In response to a question as to the availability of scholarship funds, the Chancellor said that grant funds are short compared with a year ago. The legislature did provide $300,000 of the $600,000 requested for student financial aid and some additional federal funds may also be available, but there is still a need for approximately $700,000 to reach the 1972-73 level of support for this purpose.

Mr. Stewart moved that the recommendations of the Finance Committee be adopted, although he indicated he was reluctant to do so.

Mrs. Johnson said she was going to vote against the recommendations as a protest against filling the financial gap without looking at programs for possible economies. She said she was concerned with the need for resources for new programs and improvement of funds for undergraduate education. She also referred to faculty salary increases, a possible differential in upper- and lower-division tuition, and nonresident tuition for graduate students. She indicated that all of these things needed further study. She emphasized the need for comparison with the 19 comparable institutions in all factors of educational costs and charges, if any comparisons are made.
Mr. Holmes commented that until the people of Oregon are willing to provide the tax money that is needed to provide higher education, the crisis is going to continue. He recognized the possibility of charging the students more than they are going to be able to pay, but said he could see no present alternative to approving the recommendations of the Finance Committee.

The Board approved the recommendations as presented, with Mrs. Johnson voting against the motion.

Compensation Policies, 1973-74

Staff Report to the Board

The Ways and Means Committee, in final action on the budget report on the appropriation to the Department of Higher Education, included the following note:

The Board of Higher Education may grant salary increases to academic employees of up to 5 percent of the employee's salary rate for each year of the 1973-1975 biennium. Any salary adjustments in excess of 5 percent shall be individually and specifically approved by action of the Board of Higher Education and such actions shall be reported to the Emergency Board.

Although salary adjustment funds were not separately allocated to the institutions and divisions of the Department of Higher Education by the legislature, it has been assumed in the allocation of budget quotas that $4,860,086 was available for salary adjustments in 1973-74. Of this total, $1,484,567 was for classified salary adjustments, $3,347,784 for academic salary adjustments, and $27,735 for University of Oregon Medical School residents and interns.

The classified salary adjustments are subject to elements of the Executive Department decisions and recommendations and require no Board action.

The salary adjustment for residents and interns amounts to $500 per year for 1973-74.

In distributing funds to the institutions for 1973-74, given the legislative indication of reliance on cost-per-student as the basis for future budgetary decisions, it has seemed appropriate to make the allocations to the institutions on a flat 5 percent of the total academic salaries and (summer session) vages, with two exceptions:

1. A special allocation of $67,234 to Portland State University to permit continuation of the closing of the gap between the average salary at Portland State University and the combined average salary at the other two universities.

2. The allocation of 7 percent to the University of Oregon Dental School, in recognition of the very serious lag of the University of Oregon Dental School salaries in comparison with the salaries at other dental schools. (This increase represents the same percentage reduction of University of Oregon Dental School salary increases, compared with the Board's original recommendation, as is reflected in the comparison of the Board's request and the Governor's recommendation for other academic salary adjustments.)

The 5 percent allocations to the other seven institutions would deviate from the practice of recent years in making allocations in such a manner as to maintain the dollar differential between the target salaries of the colleges and the average target salaries of the University of Oregon and Oregon State University. This deviation is justified by the comparative positions of the colleges and universities with respect to the salaries at the institutions with which comparisons are made. (In 1972-73, the colleges were at the mid-point of 21 institutions; the UO-OSU average at 16th out of 20.)

Target salaries have not been assigned to the institutions but report will be made to the Board of average salaries paid, together with such analytical comment and recommendations as may be appropriate. The report would be made prior to Board action on salary adjustment allocations for 1974-75.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was proposed that the Finance Committee recommend Board concurrence in the procedure described above and that such Board action be taken at the July 23, 1973, meeting.

In compliance with the Ways and Means Committee budget note, it is further proposed that the Board act at its July 23 meeting to approve "individually and specifically" salary increases for 12-month academic staff that may exceed 5 percent and that such increases be reported to a meeting of the Emergency Board at which one or more members of the Board can be present.
It is further proposed that salary increases for nine-month staff that exceed 5 percent be presented in two categories: promotions and other. These should be approved individually and specifically by the Board at its September 25 meeting of the Board and reported to the October 18-19 meeting of the Emergency Board.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Chairman Mosser suggested the possible consideration of allowing institutions to increase salaries by more than an average of five percent through diversion of nonsalary moneys to the purpose of improving faculty salaries (as one of the Board's prime, long-term unmet goals). The Chancellor responded by indicating that discussions with staff and institutional executives led to the conclusion that such diversion, at least in 1973-74, would cause serious harm to institutional programs. President Clark concurred.

To President Sours' expression of concern about the proposed modification of the college-university dollar differential, Mr. Mosser made his view known that neither a percentage differential nor a dollar differential should be mechanically applied.

Professor Robert Williams, chairman of the faculty chapter of the Oregon State Employee's Association at Portland State University, described the closing of the salary differential between Portland State University and the University of Oregon-Oregon State University average as proceeding at a "snail's pace." He further suggested that the proper comparison of Portland State University salaries was with other metropolitan universities. Staff was requested to work with Portland State University in development of an appropriate alternate base of comparison.

Mr. Mosser also requested review of the present list of comparison institutions. The Chancellor also indicated the need for attention to distribution of faculty by rank and average salary by rank among the several institutions.

Professor Hugon reminded the Committee that salary is just one aspect of a professional man's compensation. (Others: facilities, professional opportunities, clerical support services.)

The Committee recommended Board approval of the staff recommendations, with the understanding that salary adjustments in excess of five percent might be submitted for Board approval in part on July 23 and in part at later meetings of the Board.

Board Discussion and Action

In response to a question during the discussion, Mr. Holmer explained that the five percent increases would be distributed on one of four bases — promotion, changing responsibilities, exceptional merit, or an across-the-board increase.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Staff Report to the Committee

The 1973-74 recommended operating budgets for institutions and divisions of the State Department of Higher Education are based upon first year amounts of the Biennial Budget authorized by the 1973 Legislature. Allocation recommendations for year 1973-74 encompass operating budget program levels in the Governor's Budget, adjusted by legislative action for specific program additions or deletions and for pay adjustments for staff. Amounts reserved for the second year of the biennium include funds necessary to provide for continuation of the 1973-74 program levels and further pay adjustments for staff.

The budgets reflect activities, functions or programs by fund source. General fund appropriation and other fund expenditure limitations were set by the 1973 Legislature on the following operations:

- Education and General Services
- Division of Continuing Education
- Teaching Hospital and Clinics
- Tuberculosis Hospital
- Crippled Children's Division
- Dental Clinics
- Cooperative Extension Service
- Agricultural Experiment Station
- Forest Research Laboratory
- Auxiliary Activities
- National Direct and Health Professions Student Loans
Budget requests were acknowledged but no limitations were placed on the following programs for which no State General Fund resources are required:

Gifts, Grants and Contracts
Operating Accounts

The Education and General Services Budget

The Education and General Services 1973-74 budget is proposed to accommodate 49,631 three-term FTE students at an expenditure level of $107,343,174 for the 9 institutions, Teaching Research, Oregon Educational and Public Broadcasting Services and Centralized Activities. The proposed budget includes funds to provide academic staff salary adjustments of 5 percent, except Portland State University and the University of Oregon Dental School, where slightly higher rates are proposed, and 6.2 percent average increases for classified staff.

Revenue to support the $107,343,174 expenditure plan includes $74,717,492 in State General Funds, $225,000 in Federal Land Grant University Funds, and $32,400,682 from other funds consisting of balances carried forward from 1972-73, tuition and other fees. Tuition increases are required to generate the other fund support and to maintain the proportion of general fund—other fund resources at approximately the current level. The budget plan as presented is consistent with the fiscal year resources anticipated by the 1973 Legislature in developing the biennial appropriation and other fund expenditure limitations.

State-Wide Public Service Divisions

Biennial budgets for each of the state-wide public service divisions were approved by the 1973 Legislature, with the exception of the Tuberculosis Hospital, which was provided a one-year 1973-74 budget authorization. Biennial limitations on State General Fund and Other Fund expenditures were established for each division. Consistent with the budget authorization for Education and General Services, the budgets include amounts for pay adjustments for staff in 1972-74 and for further pay adjustments in year 1974-75.

Divisions are now in the process of developing fiscal year budgets within the biennial limitation. It was recommended that each division be authorized to present a 1973-74 budget plan consistent with the detailed budget request as modified by Legislative action, within expenditure limitations and available resources, and with sufficient resources reserved to maintain programs and further pay adjustments for staff in fiscal year 1974-75.

Specific legislative actions affecting the state-wide public service divisions are as follows:

Tuberculosis Hospital

A one-year budget was provided, with the recommendation for phase down and closure by July 1, 1974, as a result of advances in treatment of tuberculosis and continued decline in patient census. The Executive Department is to present a recommendation for providing alternate care for those tuberculosis patients still requiring hospitalization after July 1, 1974.

Agricultural Experiment Stations

Expenditure limitations were placed on the central station and each of the nine field stations. Adjustment of the limitation among field stations will require approval of the State Board of Higher Education. Other specific actions relating to research activities and reporting to the State Emergency Board are described in the Budget Report prepared by the Joint Ways and Means Committee.

Forest Research Laboratory

The 1973 Legislature recommended approval of the Governor's Budget but did not provide General Fund support for academic staff salary adjustments. Since this is the only Division in the Department which did not receive such funds, a general policy to provide salary adjustments will result in program reductions to the extent necessary to cover the salary increases. It appears that approximately $86,000 in program reductions will be necessary to maintain salary adjustments during the biennium. Additional actions of the 1973 Legislature are described in the Budget Report prepared by the Joint Ways and Means Committee.
Division of Continuing Education

The Division was provided $200,000 in State General Funds for biennium 1973-1975 with the condition that the amount be used only for college credit courses outside the major population centers.

Multnomah County Hospital

Separate legislation provides for operation of the Multnomah County Hospital by the Department of Higher Education. The operation is funded by State General Fund appropriation and patient fees. It was recommended that the Medical School be authorized to develop a 1973-74 fiscal year budget within the resources provided and at the level of service contemplated in the legislative action.

Auxiliary Activities

The biennial budget provides for continuation of current levels of service for the student enrollments projected for 1973-1975. Budgeted expenditures include increases in staff pay rates and related increases in other payroll expense. The programs are entirely self-supporting from residence hall charges, incidental fees, health service fees, and other charges to users of the services. Increases in user fees will be in accord with the Board's action of March 27, 1973, when rates for residence halls were established and guidelines for incidental, health and other fees were approved. It was recommended that the institutions be authorized to develop fiscal year budgets within an amount consistent with biennial limitations and with appropriate amounts reserved for second year staff pay increases.

Staff Recommendation

It was proposed that the Finance Committee recommend to the Board that institutions proceed with the preparation of budget plans within the guidelines described in the preceding narrative and the exhibits on pages 570 to 572.

Discussion and Recommendation of the Committee

It was suggested by Mr. Mosser that the Board's reserves ($500,000 for the biennium) be used to speed up the process of change and to help programs that are underfunded, rather than to meet crises in fuel price increases, underenrollments and similar emergencies. He urged that the Chancellor and the institutional executives bring recommendations to the Board for implementation of such a program.

It was noted that it might not be practicable to ignore certain plant rehabilitation requirements.

The Committee recommended Board approval of the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.
### DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

**Budgeted Expenditure Levels Authorized by the 1973 Legislature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
<th>1974-75</th>
<th>BIENNUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; General Services</td>
<td>$107,343,174</td>
<td>$111,779,479</td>
<td>$219,082,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Hospital &amp; Clinics</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>32,620,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled Children's Division</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6,003,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB Hospital</td>
<td>955,921</td>
<td>955,921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Clinics</td>
<td>417,651</td>
<td>431,991</td>
<td>849,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14,732,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Experiment Station</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16,405,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Research Laboratory</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,138,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Continuing Education</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,997,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary Activities</strong></td>
<td>25,601,790</td>
<td>26,201,695</td>
<td>51,803,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Direct &amp; Health</td>
<td>3,045,590</td>
<td>3,350,149</td>
<td>6,395,739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for Programs Under Limitation**: $356,096,496

* Fiscal Year Allocations are to be developed consistent with Legislative action, resources available and biennial expenditure limitations.

### RESOURCES IN SUPPORT OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICES</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; General Services</td>
<td>$153,866,776</td>
<td>$65,213,837</td>
<td>$219,082,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Hospital &amp; Clinics</td>
<td>14,691,336</td>
<td>17,729,581</td>
<td>32,602,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled Children’s Division</td>
<td>4,282,442</td>
<td>1,720,690</td>
<td>6,003,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB Hospital</td>
<td>955,921</td>
<td>955,921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Clinics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>849,642</td>
<td>849,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>7,679,084</td>
<td>14,732,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Experiment Station</td>
<td>9,678,471</td>
<td>6,726,919</td>
<td>16,405,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Research Laboratory</td>
<td>999,700</td>
<td>2,138,391</td>
<td>3,138,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Continuing Education</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>3,797,760</td>
<td>3,997,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary Activities</strong></td>
<td>11,243</td>
<td>99,482</td>
<td>110,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Direct &amp; Health</td>
<td>543,552</td>
<td>5,832,187</td>
<td>6,375,739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RHR PROGRAMS UNDER LIMITATION**: $164,000

### RESOURCES REQUIRED TO FUND BIENNIAL LIMITATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICES</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-1973 Budget Savings for Transition Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1973 Balances for Board’s Emergencies Reserve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$74,717,492</td>
<td>$74,717,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Appropriation</td>
<td>31,627,299</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,627,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Land Grant Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Year of Legislative Authorization</strong></td>
<td>$74,717,492</td>
<td>$32,625,682</td>
<td>$107,343,174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1974-75, Reserved for Second Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICES</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$79,151,284</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$79,151,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>$32,363,195</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,363,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Land Grant Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Year Reserve</strong></td>
<td>$79,151,284</td>
<td>$32,588,195</td>
<td>$111,739,479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BIENNIAL LIMITATION

**$153,866,776**

### 1973-74 Recommended Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICES</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>$26,709,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>27,519,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>17,716,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Education</td>
<td>5,432,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon College</td>
<td>6,446,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon College</td>
<td>2,854,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Technical Institute</td>
<td>4,028,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon Medical School</td>
<td>8,656,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon Dental School</td>
<td>2,796,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Research Division</td>
<td>162,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Educational &amp; Public Broadcasting Service</td>
<td>972,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Activities</td>
<td>3,531,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board’s Reserves: Plant Rehabilitation Projects</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated and Reserves for Emergencies</td>
<td>208,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated Reserves Funding Availability of Funds</td>
<td>53,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reserve for Second Year**: $107,343,174

**111,739,479**

### NOTES

Gifts, Grants and Contracts and Operating Accounts are not under expenditure limitations. Estimated expenditure levels will be included with data for Board approval of the 1973-74 detailed Budget Plan.
### Education and General Services

**Comparison of Authorized Expenditure Levels**

*Biennium 1971-1973 and Biennium 1973-1975*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong></td>
<td>$133,762,848</td>
<td>$133,820,348</td>
<td>$153,868,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Funds</strong></td>
<td>$59,877,931</td>
<td>$63,894,611</td>
<td>$65,213,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$193,640,759</td>
<td>$197,714,959</td>
<td>$219,082,653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3-Term FTE Enrollment Projections

*Biennium 1973-1975*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>13,890</td>
<td>13,979</td>
<td>14,330</td>
<td>14,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>14,936</td>
<td>14,684</td>
<td>14,637</td>
<td>14,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>9,338</td>
<td>9,060</td>
<td>9,338</td>
<td>9,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>3,132</td>
<td>3,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>4,598</td>
<td>4,634</td>
<td>4,691</td>
<td>3,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOC</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Institutions</td>
<td>47,646</td>
<td>46,427</td>
<td>46,428</td>
<td>46,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTI</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UONGS</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UODS</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FTE ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>50,530</td>
<td>49,420</td>
<td>49,631</td>
<td>49,713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The primary causes of the 1971-1973 budget being below the 1971-1973 legislative budget are as follows:

1. The Board did not increase tuition and fees to the level necessary to maintain authorized programs following legislative action to reduce General Fund appropriations without reducing total expenditure authority.

2. Underrealized enrollments reduced the amount of other fund resources which were available for expenditure in 1971-1973.

*Fee remissions are added as an other fund expenditure in the 1971-1973 budget plan for comparability with the budget presentation for 1973-1975. During 1973-1975 fee remissions were treated as a reduction of income. Beginning with July 1, 1973, fee remissions are recorded as an expenditure.*
Modification of Administrative Rules Regarding Physical Examination

The Committee reviewed the proposed modification in the administrative rules, as presented in the document, A Proposal for a Modification in the Requirement of a Physical Examination as a Condition of Enrollment. This document is bound in a separate volume and is considered an integral part of these minutes.

Dr. Romney explained that the proposal was drawn up by the Board's staff on the recommendation of the health directors of the State System institutions, who report that though the requirement that entering students submit a report of a physical examination is defensible from the standpoint of public health and the benefits to the student, it is becoming increasingly difficult to enforce. The position of the health directors is that whatever health requirements are a condition of enrollment, they should be uniformly and vigorously enforced, and if this cannot be done, a requirement should be adopted which can be enforced. The health service directors propose, in this amendment, to authorize the institutions at their discretion to accept a completed health history questionnaire in lieu of the presently required physical examination. The amendment would permit institutions using the health history questionnaire to require a special report from a private physician in special instances, for example, for students participating in varsity athletics, students with special health problems, and students needing clearance for physical education.

The Committee discussed the proposal at some length with Dr. Lee A. Gleason, director of the student health service at Portland State University and chairman of the organization of state system health service directors, and with other institutional representatives present. It was affirmed that students are being permitted to register, at least at some of the institutions, without the completed physical examination form. The health service directors have found it a nearly impossible task to procure the completed physical examination form from these students.

Mrs. Johnson said she was not convinced that college students enrolled full time should not be required to have some kind of suitable health examination prior to admission, noting that a physical examination is a requirement for entry into the first grade. She said she was not convinced students were unable to find a physician willing to give the examination, and asked whether the form required the physician to testify to anything he was not able to observe at the time of the examination.

Dr. Romney noted that the physical examination was originally institute primarily as a public health measure. The validity of the examination for this purpose has been questioned because of the great numbers of people on the campuses for whom the examination is not required. And, he continued, with the dropping of the concept of loco parentis, an increasing number of institutions across the country are dropping the required physical examination in favor of a middle ground, wherein the institution requires an individual to submit a completed statement of health problems. He said he did not know whether enforcement of the requirement as it now stands would have a depressing effect on enrollment, but that at one institution there were reported to be some 2,000 students who had been admitted without the physical examination, 1,200 at another. He said the Medical, Dental, and Nursing schools want to retain the physical examination as a protection to patients.

Mrs. Johnson asked why the registrars don't enforce the regulations. She said she saw no reason enforcement of the requirements should be the responsibility of the health service director. President Blumel explained that Portland State University traditionally has had a large number of late applications for admissions. The college tries to accommodate these students by permitting them to register without the completed physical examination form. Getting the form later takes a great deal of follow-up and is a source of great irritation to many students.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mrs. Johnson reported that Mr. Holmes, who had left the meeting before completion of discussion on this item, had told her that he would favor retention of the physical examination requirement so long as there is provision for its waiver for persons having religious convictions preventing their compliance. She, herself, favors retention of the requirement for full-time students, she said. Mr. Corey said he favored the proposed change. Mr. Corey observed that the proposed change in the Administrative Rules would leave it up to each institution to decide whether its needs would be best served by requiring a health history questionnaire or a physician-administered physical examination. He said he felt this was a question that could be left to the judgment of the institutions.

The recommended modification in the language of AR 30.030, with the proposed additions to the present AR 30.030 underlined, is hereewith presented to the Board for consideration, two members of the Academic Affairs Committee opposing the proposed modification, one member favoring it.
Proposed Amendment to AR 30.030

For the protection of the public health and benefit of the student, the Board requires a physical examination of all students or, at the discretion of the institution, in lieu thereof a completed health history questionnaire on a form to be supplied by the institution as a condition of enrollment in institutions under the control of the Board.

A special report from a private physician may be requested or required in certain special instances in institutions employing the health history questionnaire, as for example in the case of students participating in varsity athletics; students with special health problems; student needing clearance for participation in physical education.

All students must present appropriate proof of immunizations and tests as defined and described in the regulations now or hereafter approved by the Board and set forth in the institutional catalogs.

Students who decline immunization because of religious conviction or on medical grounds may be admitted, but students who decline immunization on the basis of religious conviction may be admitted only on the condition that:

1. They provide a statement from their church attesting to their church membership and to the fact that immunization is contrary to the religious beliefs of the church or religious organization to which they belong.

2. They, and in the case of minor or dependent students, their parents or guardians with them, agree in writing to assume all expense in connection with their care and isolation should they acquire, while students at the institution, those diseases for which immunization is required of other students.

Board Discussion and Action

Mrs. Johnson reviewed discussion by the Committee concerning the proposed change of the physical examination requirement. She said she had a number of reservations about the proposal and had asked Dr. Romney to explore some of these concerns further for the information of the Board.

Dr. Romney reported that he had met with the State Board of Health to explore with them questions raised by Mrs. Johnson concerning the importance of the physical examination requirement from the public health standpoint. This discussion was subsequently reported to the Board in some detail in a letter from the Board's Office to members of the Board, dated July 18. The consensus of the Board of Health was that the physical examination as a condition for admission was not essential from the standpoint of public health. He said the feeling appeared to be that student completion of a health history form was a desirable option that the institutions ought to have.

The Board discussed whether it should proceed with discussion of the proposed change in the Administrative Rules in view of the fact that should the Board favor such a change, action would be subject to public hearing scheduled for the adjourned meeting August 27. It was decided to postpone further consideration of the matter until the time of the public hearing. However, President Layman invited Dr. Beatrice K. Rose, of the State Board of Health, who was present, to present her comments, even though the Board had decided to postpone its own discussion and action.

Dr. Rose said she felt the Board would be justified in offering its institutions the option of requiring the physician-administered physical examination or the personal health history as a requirement of admission. She said it was not likely that a physical examination would turn up any physical disability of which the student was not already aware. Completion of a personal health history could be a way by which the student would learn more about his own personal health. She said that it is important as a learning experience for students that questions be worded in such a way that the student realizes the importance of answering honestly, that he understands that the information will be kept confidential, and that his attention be directed to some of the more common and pertinent health questions.
Guidelines for Institutional Relations with Affiliated Organizations

The guidelines for institutional relations with affiliated organizations were considered by the Finance Committee and the Board. As a result of the discussions at these meetings, the following guidelines were approved by the Board subject to public hearing at the Board meeting on July 23, 1973:

1. The receipt of gifts and grants
   Gifts to the institution, either directly or through an affiliated organization, shall be encouraged by employees of the Department.

   Gifts to an institution should be deposited to the credit of the State Treasurer unless the donor intended the gift to be made to an affiliated organization. In the latter case, deference to the donor requires that the institution assure that the donor’s intent is honored.

   The institution should maintain a memorandum record of gifts received directly by it as a result of efforts by an affiliated organization.

2. Budgeted support of affiliated organizations
   When approved in the budget of the institution, operations of an affiliated organization may be subsidized, to a limited and reasonable degree from funds otherwise available to the institution.

   The subsidy so provided shall be clearly and specifically identified in the biennial and annual operating budgets and accounting records of the institutions.

3. Accounting records of the institution
   The assets, liabilities, income and expenditures of affiliated organizations shall be excluded from the accounting records of the Board, its institutions and divisions.

   To protect the intent designated by the donor, gifts which are required by Board policy to be transferred from the corporate affiliate to the institution before disbursement shall be expended by the institution from restricted accounts established for such purposes. Expenditures made by the institution for purposes designated by the affiliated organization shall be made only after the transfer of funds from the affiliate to the institution.

   The institution shall prepare an annual report at the close of each fiscal year, summarizing the amounts received from each affiliated organization, the purposes intended, the expenditures therefrom, and such other information about the relationships between the affiliated organization and the institution as may be pertinent to the full disclosure of the resources held for the institution.

Staff Recommendation

If the foregoing report described policies and guidelines that are acceptable to the Committee on Finance, it was recommended that, following public hearing by the Board, the Guidelines be adopted as Administrative Rules.

Committee Discussion and Recommendation

Mr. Masser suggested that the institutions encourage gifts in broad general categories and let the Board members know their preferences in such categories. It would then be possible for the Board to publicize these requests and encourage gifts for the preferences approved by the institutions (such as endowed chairs for distinguished professors, research in certain designated broad categories, etc.).
The Finance Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Layman indicated that presentations were in order in connection with the public hearing on Guidelines Governing Institutional Relations with Affiliated Organizations. There being no response, the Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Mr. Layman said a letter had been submitted by Mr. Donald Wellman for the Amazon Cooperating Tenants. The letter requested an opportunity to be heard in connection with an appeal on the rental rates established by the University of Oregon and upheld by the Chancellor's Office for the Amazon housing.

Mr. Michael Doran, representing the Amazon Cooperating Tenants read a letter, dated July 20, 1973, from Attorney Robert L. Ackerman. The letter stated that Board policy required rental rates to be established by the institutional executive with the approval of the Chancellor and to be reported to the Board by June 1 of the preceding fiscal year. The rates being appealed were established after June 1, 1973, and Mr. Ackerman therefore concluded that the increase proposed is null and void.

Mr. Layman referred the legal question to the Board's attorney, Mr. John Leahy.

Mr. Doran then presented a statement by the Amazon Cooperating Tenants protesting the rate increase for the following reasons:

1. Little meaningful discussion has taken place concerning the assumptions related in the University's cost analyses;

2. Specific criticism of the assumptions and cost analyses based on them as detailed in the statement; and

3. There is no justification for a rental rate increase at Amazon under the Board's policy governing married student housing.

The complete report is on file in the Board's Office.

Mr. Holmer responded that the report of the increase was not made until after June 1 as a result of a series of factors, including requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act and an effort to assure students of an adequate opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Holmer said there were two issues in question with respect to the need for a rate increase. The first is the apportionment of certain costs on a pro rata basis. In determining this distribution, the methods most beneficial to Amazon was chosen, 32.5 percent based on the number of units. The second issue is the charge for maintenance costs and maintenance reserves. The Chancellor's recommendation was based on the fact that the University's recommendation had been considered carefully and was justified. In addition, the rent-setting authority was delegated very clearly and specifically to the institutional executive.

Upon motion by Mr. Stewart, the Board upheld the Chancellor's approval of the rental increase on appeal to the Board by Amazon Cooperating Tenants.

President Layman reported that the next regular Board meeting is scheduled for September 25, 1973, on the campus of Portland State University. He indicated that it was intended to have an adjourned session of the July 23, 1973, Board meeting, to be held in connection with the August 27 and 28 Committee meetings.

Mr. Layman announced that Committee meetings were to be held August 27-28, 1973, at the Oregon State University Marine Sciences Center at Newport.

Mr. Layman also reminded the Board of the joint meeting with the Board of Education and the Educational Coordinating Council in Salem on September 21, 1973.

Mr. Layman said that the July Board meeting is the occasion for the annual election of officers.

Mr. Stewart moved that the incumbent officers be elected to serve again for 1973-74. The Board approved the motion and the following officers were elected: Mr. George H. Layman, President; Mr. John W. Snider, Vice President, and Mr. George H. Corey, member of the Executive Commit
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Meeting of
Committee on Academic Affairs, June 22, 1973

A regular meeting of the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs was held June 22, 1973, in Room 338, Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University, at 9:00 A.M. The Committee considered the following matters:

1. Resolution Concerning Funding for the Pacific Rim Program at Portland State University

Mr. Mosser noted that the question of funding for the Pacific Rim Program at Portland State University was under consideration by the legislature, and that proposals had been made to reduce the funding to below the $430,000 considered by Portland State University to be the minimum required for successful operation of the program. Funding the program at less than a minimum level, he noted, would force Portland State University to divert funds from on-going programs to support the new program. He said a number of programs in Oregon are already underfunded and it would be a disservice to the state to start still another underfunded program.

Chancellor Lieuallen reviewed the status of the Pacific Rim Program proposal before the legislature. He and Vice President Blumel confirmed that the Board had indicated to the subcommittee considering the matter a minimum budget figure of $435,000.

Mr. Westerdahl said he agreed completely with Mr. Mosser's position, that the Pacific Rim Program should not be done at all if it cannot be done properly. He said he understood that under the new funding system for higher education being considered by the legislature, the institution and the Board would have to review program priorities and absorb the Pacific Rim Program into the regular budget of the institution during the second biennium, but special funding was required during the first biennium of the program's operation to get it underway. He said he could not approve diversion of funds from other programs at Portland State University for this purpose.

Mr. Mosser said the Pacific Rim Program had never been evaluated by the Board in terms of priorities for program development. The program was suggested from outside the Board as one needed by the state which would be funded and the Board has cooperated in trying to set up a good program. If the program had been approved through the regular curricular procedures, it would have had a much more thorough review by both the institution and by the Committee on Academic Affairs, which would involve a period of two or three years. He said he was not prepared to cut funding of other programs to support the Pacific Rim Program until it had received this kind of review. He suggested that the Chancellor should be provided an official expression of the feeling of the Board concerning funding of the Pacific Rim Program for transmission to the legislature, and that this might be accomplished by resolution of the Academic Affairs Committee. Mr. Westerdahl concurred.

Mrs. Johnson suggested that since only two members of the Committee were present, passage of the resolution be postponed until Mr. Corey was present. Subsequently, the three members of the Committee approved the proposed resolution, as follows, by unanimous vote.

The Board of Higher Education desires to respond to Oregon's growing concerns for our cultural and economic relations with the countries of the Pacific Rim. In fact, teaching, research and administrative faculty members of the System for many years have been actively engaged in developing proposals for expanding our teaching and research programs focused on Pacific Rim nations. The Board believes, however, that many existing programs, when compared with similar programs elsewhere, currently are underfunded. It is undesirable from the Board's view to add another underfunded program that would place additional financial strain on existing programs. The Board agrees that in the long run, a new major program such as the Pacific Rim Studies Center should be absorbed into the permanent cost of the institution. In the short run, however, to initiate a major new program, start-up expenditures are essential. In fact, at the outset, the full budgeted costs need to be provided to avoid draining resources from other programs. Thus, the Board urges the legislative assembly to appropriate no less than $435,000 for the 1973-1975 biennium to support the Pacific Rim Studies Center, thus enabling the new program to begin with at least minimal opportunity for success.

2. A Report on Recommendations of the Joint Library Study Pertaining to the Department of Higher Education

Discussion and Committee recommendations on this matter are presented for the consideration of the Board elsewhere in these minutes.
3. Continuation of the Committee's Review of Objectives of the Tenure System and Proposed Modifications in the Administrative Rules Governing Tenure

The Committee reviewed the draft statement of objectives and proposed modifications in the Administrative Rules (dated June 22, 1973), prepared for it by the Office of Academic Affairs. Testimony was received from representatives of interested faculty groups, institutional administrative personnel, and others. Following lengthy and exhaustive consideration, the Committee approved the draft referred to above with certain modifications approved by the Committee and voted to transmit to the Board the amended draft with recommendation that it be adopted by the Board. The Committee presents its recommendation for approval by the Board elsewhere in these minutes.

4. Modification of the Administrative Rules Regarding the Requirement of a Physical Examination as a Condition of Enrollment

Discussion and Committee recommendation on this matter are presented for the consideration of the Board elsewhere in these minutes.

5. Report on a Cooperative Physics/Engineering Program Developed by ECC and OSU and on an Interdisciplinary Option in Pest Management for Plant Protection at OSU

The report, titled Report to the Board on the Development of an Experimental Cooperative Program in Physics/Engineering by Oregon State University and Eastern Oregon College and on Development of an Interdisciplinary Option in Pest Management for Plant Protection for Majors in Agronomic Crop Science, Horticulture, Soil Science, General Agriculture, Botany, and Entomology at Oregon State University, was accepted as presented. It is bound in a separate document and made an integral part of these minutes.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Fire and Safety Improvements within Weatherford Hall, OSU

In accordance with authorization granted by the Board on November 27, 1972, the Board's staff has approved plans and specifications for various fire detection and safety improvements and other minor remodeling within Weatherford Hall at Oregon State University, and has arranged for portions of the work to be done by contract and the remainder by the Physical Plant Department.

A contract award in the amount of $17,135 was made to Allis & Evans, Inc., Eugene, who submitted the lowest bid on December 12, 1972, for the construction of additional fire escapes on the tower unit of the building. Subsequently, the Physical Plant Department purchased and installed ionization detectors and undertook minor remodeling within the residence hall at a cost of about $15,000.

The largest segment of the total project was the installation of the fire sprinkler system, for which the plans and specifications were prepared with the assistance of Morrison, Funnale & Associates, Inc., consulting engineers, Portland. The five bids received for the sprinklers on June 14, 1973, ranged from a low of $42,056 to a high of $59,670. A contract award has been made to the lowest bidder, M. B. Hinds, Beaverton, and the work is now in progress.

All portions of the fire and safety improvements project, including professional service fees, construction supervision, etc., are being financed from balances available to the institution from its residence hall sinking fund reserve and are expected to be accomplished within the maximum of $100,000 which the Board and the State Emergency Board allocated from the expenditure limitation of $1,050,000 approved by the 1971 Legislature for remodeling within Weatherford Hall at Oregon State University.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Capital Construction Program for 1973-1975

The schedule shown below provides a comparative summary of the Board's requests for capital construction, major rehabilitation and land purchases during 1973-1975 with the Governor's budget recommendations and the program approved by the 1973 Legislature. It should be noted that the authorization contained within Enrolled House Bill 2682 for facilities for the Joyce Thompson Institute for Plant Research Inc., is conditional upon the execution of a mutually satisfactory contract providing for the relocation of the Institute to the Oregon State University campus by October 1, 1973, and action by the State Emergency Board in allotting the preliminary planning funds appropriated for the project. All other items of capital construction for the Board during 1973-1975 were incorporated within Enrolled House Bill 5097.
# OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
## CAPITAL OUTLAY PROGRAM FOR 1973-1975
### COMPARISON OF BOARD'S REQUESTS AND GOVERNOR'S BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS WITH LEGISLATIVE AUTHORIZATION IN 1973 (REGULAR SESSION)
(Cost Estimates in Thousands of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Board's Requests</th>
<th>Governor's Recommendations</th>
<th>Legislative Authorization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Educational and General Plant - State Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OTI</td>
<td>Classroom, Laboratory and Office Facilities and Water Chiller</td>
<td>$ - 2,500</td>
<td>$ 2,500</td>
<td>$ 2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Straub Hall Remodel for Academic Use</td>
<td>1,715 1,715</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Animal Care Facilities</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Dearborn Hall Remodel</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Utility Improvements</td>
<td>615*</td>
<td>615*</td>
<td>615*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UOMS</td>
<td>1,405*</td>
<td>1,125*</td>
<td>1,405*</td>
<td>1,405*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>175*</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>615*</td>
<td>615*</td>
<td>615*</td>
<td>615*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>420*</td>
<td>420*</td>
<td>420*</td>
<td>420*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UOSS</td>
<td>Clinic Equipment Replacement and Related Alterations</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>Classroom, Laboratory and Office Building (Fine Arts)</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Various Remodeling Projects</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Withcombe Hall and Farm Crop Building Remodel</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Various Land Purchases</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UOMS</td>
<td>Marine Biology Station Alterations, Charleston</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Music Building Addition and Alterations</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Office and Classroom Facilities Acquisition and Rehabilitation, Including Land</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Churchill Hall Remodel</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>UOSS</td>
<td>Dental School Buildings Remodel</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>DEPB</td>
<td>Television Improvements</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>UOMS</td>
<td>Mackenzie Hall and Administration Building Remodel</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Marine Science Library and Laboratory Building Addition, Yaquina Bay</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>UOMS</td>
<td>Teaching Hospital Fire Sprinkling System</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>UOMS</td>
<td>University Tuberculosis Hospital Fire Sprinkling System</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>$20,690</td>
<td>$16,225</td>
<td>$8,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Boyce Thompson Institute for Plant Research (including preliminary planning of $70,000)</td>
<td>6,8200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,8200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>$27,410</td>
<td>$16,225</td>
<td>$16,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Educational and General Plant - Gifts, Grants, Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>UOSS</td>
<td>Dental School Buildings Remodel</td>
<td>$ 600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>DEPB</td>
<td>Television Improvements</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>UOMS</td>
<td>Cancer Center Facilities and Related Alterations</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>UOMS</td>
<td>Ophthalmology Clinic Expansion</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>$2,330</td>
<td>$1,730</td>
<td>$2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totals - Educational and General Plant</td>
<td>$29,740</td>
<td>$17,955</td>
<td>$16,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Utility Improvements</td>
<td>410*</td>
<td>410*</td>
<td>410*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UOMS</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>45*</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>95*</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>280*</td>
<td>280*</td>
<td>280*</td>
<td>280*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Spring Sports Complex (Phase I)</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Various Land Purchases</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>$13,155</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$13,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Totals</td>
<td>$42,895</td>
<td>$22,755</td>
<td>$32,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Partial cost; portions financed within the Educational and General Plant and from Auxiliary Enterprises.

** Items deleted subsequent to preparation of Governor's budget recommendations on December 1, 1972.

@ Legislative authorization for facilities for the Boyce Thompson Institute for Plant Research is provided within House Bill 3262; all other capital outlay items noted above are provided within House Bill 5097.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board accepted the report as presented.
### SUMMARY OF GIFTS AND GRANTS TO DATE FOR
### YEAR 1973-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Total</th>
<th>Cumulative Total for Current Year</th>
<th>Comparable Cumulative Total for Preceding Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The following gifts and grants to the institutions have been approved for acceptance and expenditure by the institutions and the Board's Office in accordance with Board action on January 27-28, 1964. It was recommended that the Secretary of the Board be authorized to make suitable acknowledgement to the donors and grantors. The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Oregon State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarships &amp; Fellowships</th>
<th>Gifts totaling $94,474.97 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Legion, Cottage Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Legion Auxiliary, Salem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Anukam Memorial, through Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clatskanie High School (National Honor Society Scholarship), Clatskanie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Commonwealth Of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crown Zellerbach Foundation, San Francisco, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John W. Dargavel Foundation, through Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Valley Lumber Scholarship Fund, through the First National Bank of Oregon, Roseburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louis W. and Maude Hill Family Foundation, St. Paul, Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Johnson Fellowship, through the First National Bank of Oregon, Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Link Foundation, New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lions Club, McMinnville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts Fund (Joseph E. Simmons Scholarship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meier &amp; Frank Company, Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukie Rod &amp; Gun Club, Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phi Kappa Phi, through Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. R. Randall Memorial Fund, through Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth P. Ritchie Fund, through Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azalea &amp; Charles Sager Fund, through Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siculcar Foundation, San Francisco, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sigma Phi Epsilon Educational Foundation, Richmond, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon State Scholarship Commission, Eugene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buena M. Steinmetz Fund, through Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strickland Scholarships, through Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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American Cancer Society, Oregon Division Grant of $9,750 from the American Cancer Society, Oregon Division, Portland, for a study "To Learn Why Neuroblastoma Cells Do Not Appear To Form Synapses or a Synaptosomal Fraction as Found in Normal Neurons," July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Robert W. Newburgh, Head of the Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics.

Bonneville Power Administration Grant of $3,631.25 from the Bonneville Power Administration for research concerned with "Improved Serviceability of Wood Products," under the direction of Mr. Robert Graham, Associate Professor.

E. Bores Gift of a 52-volume set of The Harvard Classics, valued at $175, from Mr. Edward Bores, Newport.

Colorado State University Subgrant of $7,309 through Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, for research entitled, "Avian Population and Dietary Analysis," January 1, 1973, through December 31, 1973, under the direction of Dr. John A. Wiens, Associate Professor of Zoology. This is part of a National Science Foundation grant for the Grassland Biome Project.

Educational Coordinating Council Subgrant of $16,727 through the Educational Coordinating Council, Salem, for a training program in Mass Media Utilization for Minority Persons," May 19 through August 10, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Richard J. Weinman, Associate Professor of Speech Communications. This represents funds available under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Englund Bequest Bequest of $4,000 from the Estate of Dr. Eric Englund, deceased, through the National Savings and Trust Company, Washington, D. C., to provide two $2,000 post-graduate scholarships, as funds are available, to be awarded annually to a graduate of Oregon State University, for study in the field of Agricultural Economics or Home Economics. The study is to be pursued in college or university of student's choosing, with advice and upon approval of Oregon State University.

Embassy of France Grant of $200 from the Embassy of France, New York City, to provide funds during 1972-73 for the French language program.

Esso Production Research Co. Gift of a teledyne high energy profiling system to be used by the geologists during a cruise to the area off South America, from Esso Production Research Co., Houston, Texas. The gift is valued at $5,000.

Governor's Manpower Planning Council Grant of $6,397 from the Governor's Manpower Planning Council, Salem, "to pay costs for technical assistance in the collection and distribution of manpower data," April 1 through September 10, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Gary W. Sorenson, Chairman of the Department of Economics.

The Harlan & Dumars Farms Gift of seed cleaning equipment, valued at $12,800, from The Harlan and Dumars Farms, Woodland, California, for the Foundation Seed Project in the School of Agriculture.
Gift of a collection of memorabilia, valued at $925, for the Horner Museum, and pictures valued at $260, for the Art Department, from Mrs. Curtis Holt, Portland.

Bequest of $1,730.67 from the estate of Mr. Charles A. Howard, through the Pioneer Trust Company, Salem, to be added to the student loan fund.

Grant of $10,273.64 from the National Council of the Paper Industry, New York City, for "Sulfite Waste Liquor Research," September 2, 1972, through March 31, 1973, under the direction of Mr. James G. Knudsen, Associate Dean of Engineering.

Grants totaling $716,774 from the National Science Foundation, Washington, D. C., for research, training programs, and other purposes as follows:

1. $4,600 - "Molecular Vibrations, Mainly in Crystals," January 1, 1971, through March 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. J. C. Decius, Professor of Chemistry.

2. $50,000 - "The Laminar Structure in the Arctic Ocean," January 1, 1971, through September 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Stephen Nesby, Associate Professor of Oceanography.

3. $11,574 - "Graduate Traineeship Program," March 2, 1971, through September 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Carl Bond, Assistant Dean of the Graduate School.

4. $475,000 - "Collaborative Research in an Investigation of the Nasca Lithospheric Plate and Its Interaction with the South American Continental Block," May 1, 1971, through October 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. LaVerne D. Kulm, Associate Professor of Oceanography.

5. $27,000 - "Analysis of Photosynthesis through Mutant Studies," June 1, 1972, through November 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Norman I. Bishop, Professor of Plant Physiology.


9. $55,000 - "Nature and Environmental Response of Marine Psychrophilic Bacteria," June 1, 1973, through November 30, 1974,
under the direction of Dr. Richard Y. Morita, Professor of Microbiology.

10. $34,900 - "Accelerated Planetary Boundary Layer Flow in the Presence of Baroclinity and Heat Fluxes," July 1, 1973, through December 31, 1975, under the direction of Dr. Larry J. Mahrt, Assistant Professor of Atmospheric Science.

11. $23,800 - "Electronic Properties of Amorphous Thallium-Tellurium Alloys," July 1, 1973, through December 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Melvin Cutler, Professor of Physics.

Oregon State Employment Division Grant of $504.96 from the Oregon State Employment Division, Salem, for "on-the-job training of a handicapped person," May 1 through August 10, 1973, under the direction of Mr. Anthony Birch, University Budget Officer.

Oregon Heart Association Grant of $5,000 from the Oregon Heart Association, Portland, for research entitled, "Structure and Function of the Isozyme of Lactic Dehydrogenase," July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Sonia R. Anderson, Associate Professor of Biochemistry and Biophysics.

Oregon State University Foundation Grant of $158,969.45 from the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis, for the following purposes:

1. $150,000 - As the first of several payments for the Spring Sports Complex construction.

2. $8,969.45 - To be applied to the Horse Center construction.

Oregon Traffic Safety Commission Grant of $40,300 from the Oregon Traffic Safety Commission, Salem, "for a summer institute for Driver Education Teachers," March 13, 1973, through February 28, 1974 under the direction of Dr. David C. Lawson, Assistant Professor of Health Education.

Sigma Chi Foundation Gift of $100 from the Sigma Chi Foundation, Evanston, Illinois, "to provide a Peterson Significant Chapter Award for counseling and tutoring during the 1972-73 school year, with preference going to Sigma Chi members."

Miss Elizabeth Strong Gifts valued at $1,600 from Miss Elizabeth Strong, Corvallis, as follows:

1. $1,125 - Representing the value of a 17 foot catamaran boat, an 18 hp EvinRude boat motor, one boat motor stand, and one Sears Zenith battery, given to the School of Oceanography.

2. $475 - Representing the value of a Geodesic dome, given to the North Willamette Experiment Station for use as a greenhouse.

N. L. Tartar Gift of a collection of Indian art work, valued at $3,000, from Dr. N. L. Tartar, Corvallis, to the Horner Museum.
Grants totaling $23,865.11 from the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., for research and other purposes as follows:

1. $2,800 - "Microclimate of a Mountain Huckleberry Field," under the direction of Dr. Lloyd W. Gay, Associate Professor, Forest Research Laboratory.

2. $140.77 - "Develop a Joint Capacity for Isoenzyme Research to Implement Genetic Analysis of Douglas-fir and Northwest Species," under the direction of Dr. Kim Ching, Professor, Forest Research Laboratory.

3. $1,210.02 - "Management Alternatives for the Drift Creek Watershed," under the direction of Dr. J. H. Beuter, Associate Professor, Forest Research Laboratory.

4. $214.32 - "Investigation of Sub-Surface Water Flow In and About Roadways on Unstable, Forested Slopes," under the direction of Dr. Dennis Harr, Assistant Professor, Forest Research Laboratory.

5. $19,500 - "Analysis of Anadromous Fish Habitat: Contribution of Streamside Vegetation to the Food Resource," June 5, 1973, through June 30, 1975, under the direction of Dr. James D. Halli, Associate Professor of Fisheries.

Grant of $166,529 from the U. S. Department of the Army, Walla Walla, Washington, "for a wildlife study along the Columbia River," April 20, 1973, through December 31, 1975, under the direction of Dr. Charles E. Warren, Acting Head of Fisheries and Wildlife.

Grants totaling $80,026 from the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., for research as follows:

1. $6,666 - "Ionocyte Formation in Animal Salt Secreting Epithelia," October 1, 1971, through June 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Frank Conte, Professor of Zoology.

2. $5,250 - "Properties of Enzymes from Thermomorphs and Halophiles," April 1 through June 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. R. R. Becker, Professor of Biochemistry.

3. $33,300 - "Studies of Low Energy Induced Nuclear Fission," June 15, 1973, through December 14, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Walter D. Loveland, Assistant Professor of Chemistry.

4. $34,810 - "For purchase of equipment," June 1 through 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Norman H. Cutshall, Research Associate of Oceanography.
Grants totaling $15,279.08 from the U. S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., for research and other purposes as follows:

1. $13,014.98 - "Animal Damage Control in the Reforestation of Forest Lands," under the direction of Dr. Hugh Black, Associate Professor, Forest Research Laboratory.

2. $264.10 - "Fate of Organic Arsenical Herbicides in Chemically Thinned Forests in Oregon and Washington," under the direction of Dr. Michael Newton, Associate Professor, Forest Research Laboratory.

3. $2,000 - "Intra and Interspecific Hybridization of the Genus Pseudotsuga," under the direction of Dr. K. K. Ching, Professor, Forest Research Laboratory.

Grant of $17,449 from the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D. C., for research entitled, "NMR Studies on the Molecular Interaction of Pesticides of Environmental Concern," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Rizqahul Haque, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Chemistry.

Grants totaling $488,413 from the U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D. C., for research and other purposes, as follows:

1. $25,193 - "For research studies on Intracellular Parasitism," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Ramon J. Seidler, Assistant Professor of Microbiology.

2. $26,992 - "Biochemistry of Procarbazine and related Hydrazines," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Donald J. Reed, Associate Professor of Biochemistry.

3. $48,726 - "Environmental Cadmium - Its Effects and Interactions," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Paul H. Weswig, Professor of Agricultural Chemistry.

4. $49,476 - "N-Nitros Amines in Foods," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Richard A. Scanlan, Assistant Professor of Food Science and Technology.

5. $15,410 - "Neural Detection of Ionizing Radiations," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Donald J. Kimeldorf, Professor of Radiation Biology

6. $20,593 - "Lactose Utilization by Lactic Streptococci," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. William E. Sandine, Professor of Microbiology.

7. $15,205 - "Associating Systems and Enzyme Control," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Robert D. Dyson, Associate Professor of Biophysics.

8. $29,652 - "Biomedical Sciences Support Grant," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the Direction of Dr. Roy A. Young, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies.
9. $27,455 - "Synthesis of Methymycin," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. James D. White, Associate Professor of Chemistry.

10. $42,367 - "Mycotoxin Toxicity and Carcinogenesis," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Russell O. Sinnhuber, Professor of Food Science and Technology.

11. $27,598 - "Biochemical Basis for Establishment of Cell Polarity," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Quatrano, Assistant Professor of Botany.

12. $17,724 - "To pay salary costs under a development award in behalf of Sonia R. Anderson," July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. R. W. Newburgh, Chairman, Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics.

13. $31,916 - "Training Program in Microbiology," July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Paul R. Elliker, Head of the Department of Microbiology.


15. $32,100 - "Training Program in Toxicology," July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Charles E. Warren, Professor of Fisheries.

16. $37,917 - "Training Program in Food Protection and Toxicology," July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Harold W. Schultz, Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology.

17. $21,970 - "Training Program in Hospital Engineering," July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. James L. Riggs, Head of Industrial Engineering.

University of Washington
Subgrant of $5,510 through the University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, for research entitled, "Coniferous Forest Biome," January 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973, under the direction of Mr. Richard H. Waring, Assistant Professor of Forest Management.

Urban Management Consultants
Grant of $3,446 from the Urban Management Consultants, San Francisco, California, "for research on methods to improve HEW funded manpower programs," April 1, 1973, through June 1, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Gary Sorenson, Chairman of Economics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants to</th>
<th>Grants to the several Agricultural Experiment Station Departments and Divisions, for research work and other purposes, from various donors, as follows:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agric. Exper. Stations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Research Foundation</td>
<td>$6,500 - &quot;Insecticide Residue Research,&quot; under the direction of Dr. Leon C. Terriere, Professor of Biochemistry and Insect Toxicology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$523.97 - &quot;Effectiveness of Fungicides,&quot; under the direction of Dr. Malcolm E. Corden, Professor of Plant Pathology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000 - &quot;Improvement of Yield and Quality of Hops,&quot; under the direction of Dr. C. E. Horner, Professor of Plant Pathology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,016.85 - &quot;Control of Soil Temperature with Reactor Cooling Water,&quot; under the direction of Dr. L. Boersma, Professor of Soil Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Hoechst Corporation</td>
<td>$2,000 - &quot;Evaluation of fungicides for the control of diseases of tree fruits,&quot; under the direction of Mr. Iain C. MacSwan, Extension Plant Pathology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babcock Poultry Farms, Inc.</td>
<td>$210 - &quot;Representing the value of 600 B300-F Babcock chicks to be used in experiments,&quot; under the direction of Dr. P. E. Bernier, Professor of Poultry Genetics and Dr. R. W. Dorminey, Assistant Professor of Poultry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevron Chemical Company</td>
<td>$600 - &quot;Evaluation of Fungicides for the Control of Diseases of Tree Fruits,&quot; under the direction of Mr. Iain C. MacSwan, Extension Plant Pathology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Solvents Corp.</td>
<td>$2,500 - &quot;Research on beef cattle management,&quot; under the direction of Dr. C. L. Foster, Assistant Professor of Animal Nutrition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coos County</td>
<td>$750 - &quot;Resistance of Port Orford Cedar to Phytophthora Root Rot,&quot; under the direction of Dr. Lewis F. Roth, Professor of Botany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Shamrock Corporation</td>
<td>$2,000 - &quot;Fungicide Testing-Diseases of Fruit Trees,&quot; under the direction of Mr. Iain C. MacSwan, Extension Plant Pathologist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dow Chemical Company</td>
<td>$4,000 - &quot;Weed Investigations,&quot; under the direction of Dr. A. P. Appleby, Associate Professor of Agronomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood River Grower Shipper Association</td>
<td>$2,500 - &quot;Phenological Responses of Pears and apples,&quot; under the direction of Mr. W. M. Mellenthin, Professor of Horticulture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of the Paper Industry</td>
<td>$10,000 - &quot;Research on the effect of paper mill effluent on streams,&quot; under the direction of Dr. Charles E. Warren, Professor of Fisheries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor-Am Agricultural Products, Inc.</td>
<td>$300 - &quot;Entomological work,&quot; under the direction of Dr. R. W. Zwick, Associate Professor of Entomology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Olympic Fur Breeders Assoc., Inc. $3,000 - "In support of experimental research being conducted at the Oregon State University Mink Farm," under the direction of Dr. J. E. Oldfield, Professor of Animal Nutrition.

Oregon State Game Commission $10,000 - "Support of Fishery Unit," under the direction of Dr. C. E. Warren, Professor of Fisheries.

Oregon State University Foundation $1,474 - "Douglas Fir Rooting Project," under the direction of Dr. A. N. Roberts, Professor of Horticulture.

Pennwalt Corporation $2,000 - "Evaluation of Fungicides for the Control of Diseases of Tree Fruits," under the direction of Mr. Iain C. MacSvan, Extension Plant Pathology.

The Proctor & Gamble Company $250 - "To support research on promising new pesticides in entomological studies," under the direction of Dr. R. W. Zwick, Associate Professor of Entomology.

Skylane Farms $210 - "Representing the value of 600 B300-F Babcock chicks to be used in experiments," under the direction of Dr. P. E. Bernier, Professor of Poultry Genetics and Dr. R. W. Dorminey, Assistant Professor of Poultry.


U. S. Dept. of Agriculture $990.40 - "Insect Investigations," under the direction of Dr. J. A. Kamm, Research Entomologist.

U.S.D.A., Agricultural Research Service $1,490.36 - "Research in Crop Science," under the direction of Mr. H. H. Rampton, Associate Professor Emeritus of Agronomy; Dr. R. H. Converse, Professor of Plant Pathology; and Dr. E. J. Trione, Professor of Botany and Plant Pathology.


U.S.D.A., ARS, Research Agreements & Patents Management Branch $750 - "New crop research," under the direction of Dr. David Stamp, Assistant Professor of Agronomic Crops.

U. S. Forest Service $526 - "Research on Prairie Falcon," under the direction of Dr. C. I. Warren, Professor of Fisheries.

Wasco County Fruit & Produce League $14,750 - "In support of research on effects of fluoride on selected tree crops," under the direction of Dr. T. J. Facteau, Research Associate, and Mr. W. M. Mellenthin, Professor of Horticulture and Superintendent, Mid-Columbia Experiment Station.
University of Oregon

Scholarships & Fellowships  Gifts totaling $13,670.49 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

- America's Junior Miss Scholarship Foundation, Mobile, Alabama $297.99
- Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, Inc., Hampton, Virginia 300.00
- Business and Professional Womens Foundation, Washington, D.C. 300.00
- Cockerline Memorial Trust Fund, through the United States National Bank of Oregon, Salem 334.00
- Emerald Empire Honor Band, Eugene 150.00
- Eugene Symphony Association, Eugene 1,931.00
- Georgia-Pacific Foundation, Portland 250.00
- Walter E. Heller and Company, Chicago, Illinois 1,000.00
- Hofstra University, Hempstead, Long Island, New York 250.00
- E. F. Hutton and Company, San Francisco, California 100.00
- IBM Research Laboratory, San Jose, California 7,206.00
- P.E.O. Sisterhood, Coos Bay 251.50
- Price Waterhouse Foundation, New York City 1,000.00
- The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Mariana Islands 300.00

American Cancer Society Grant of $500 from the American Cancer Society, New York City, to provide an "institutional allowance on behalf of Peter J. Dahlinger, January 1, 1971, through December 31, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Peter von Hippel, Chairman, Institute of Molecular Biology.

Collins Medical Trust Grant of $1,400 from the Collins Medical Trust, Portland, for a project entitled, "Reconstruction of Human Motion by Computer Animation," June 1, 1973, through June 1, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Clifford E. Brubaker, Assistant Professor of Physical Education.

Educational Coordinating Council Subgrant of $12,069 through the Educational Coordinating Council, Salem, for a project entitled, "Continuing Education and Counseling on Death, Dying and Mourning," May 7, 1973, through May 7, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Frances G. Scott, Director of the Oregon Center for Gerontology. These funds are available under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Englund Bequest Bequest of $2,000 from the estate of Dr. Eric Englund, deceased, through the National Savings and Trust Company, Washington, D.C., to provide, "one scholarship annually for a graduate (man or woman) of the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, for post-graduate study in the field of American Literature or American History and related subjects. Such study may be pursued in any college or university selected by the student with the advice and approval of the authorities of the University of Oregon."
Grant of $3,263.50 from the Johnson Foundation, through the U. S. National Bank - Trust Department, Portland, "for the purchase of a new lithography press and stones, to be used strictly for instructional purposes," under the direction of Mr. Robert S. Harris, Dean of the Department of Architecture and Allied Arts.

Grants totaling $280,228 from the National Science Foundation, Washington, D. C., for research and other purposes as follows:

1. $42,500 - "Neural Basis of Circadian Rhythm," May 15, 1973, through October 31, 1975, under the direction of Dr. Marvin E. Gordon-Lickey, Associate Professor of Psychology.

2. $22,200 - "Archaeology of the Northern Great Basin," June 1, 1973, through November 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. C. Melvin Aikins, Associate Professor of Anthropology, and Dr. David Cole, Acting Director of the Museum of Natural History.

3. $18,800 - "Involutive Algebras, Algebras of Operators and Harmonic Analysis," June 1, 1973, through December 31, 1974, under the direction of Mr. Theodore W. Palmer, Mr. Kenneth A. Ross and Mr. B. A. Barnes, Professors of Mathematics.


5. $6,167 - "Final adjustment of the Graduate Traineeship Program," June 21, 1971, through September 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Calvin Fisk, Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate School.

6. $15,761 - "A Collaborative Program of Teaching and Research at the Technical University of Wroclaw, Wroclaw, Poland," July 7, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Virgil Boekelheide, Professor of Chemistry.

7. $70,000 - "Low Temperature Physics," July 1, 1973 through August 31, 1975, under the direction of Dr. George W. Rayfield, Associate Professor of Physics.

8. $81,800 - "Theory of Solids," July 1, 1973, through December 31, 1975, under the direction of Dr. Joel W. McClure, Professor and Head of the Department of Physics, and Dr. Gregory H. Wannier, Professor of Physics.

Subgrants totaling $68,070 through the Oregon Mathematics Education Council, Salem, for the following projects:

1. $9,602 - "To provide salary and fringe benefits for Dr. David Moursund during the 1972-73 academic years as Director of the Computer Science Component of the Oregon System in Mathematics Education, September 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Eugene Maler, Professor of Mathematics."

2. $58,468 - "For support of the University’s Summer Mathematics Program," May 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Alan Hoffer, Associate Professor of Mathematics.

These funds are available to the Oregon Mathematics Education Council through a grant from the National Science Foundation.

Gift of $250 from the State Association of University of Oregon Women, Eugene, to the Mary P. Spiller Loan Fund.

Grant of $97,000 from the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Richland, Washington, for research entitled, "Theory of Elementary Particles," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. M. J. Moravesik and Dr. F. L. Csonka, Professor and Associate Professor, Institute of Theoretical Science.

Grant of $98,505 from the U. S. Department of the Air Force, Office of Scientific Research, Arlington, Virginia, for research entitled, "Coding Systems and the Comprehension of Instructional Materials," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Ray Hyman, Professor of Psychology.

Grants totaling $1,041,085 from the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C., for research and other purposes as follows:

1. $94,155 - "Teacher Corps Intervening Summer Training Program—Seventh Cycle," June 16 through September 1, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Stanley Cohen, Director, Teacher Corps.

2. $729,510 - "Support of Training, Management, and Research for Follow-Through Districts (Englemann-Becker Model)," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Wesley Becker, Professor of Education.

3. $212,420 - "For support of the 1973-74 NDEA Graduate Fellowship Program," September 1, 1973, through August 31, 1974, under the direction of Mr. C. W. Fisk, Assistant Dean of the Graduate School.

4. $5,000 - "Comprehensive Rehabilitation of the Severely Handicapped," May 1, 1973, through June 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Harold W. James, Assistant Professor of Education.
Grant of $9,500 from the U. S. Department of the Interior, Seattle, Washington, "For Phase III of the final analysis of the John Day Reservoir archaeological research project," June 1, 1973, through December 31, 1974, under the direction of Mr. David L. Cole, Curator of Anthropology, and Acting Director of the Museum of Natural History.

Grants totaling $546,067 from the U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D. C., for research, training grants, supplies, and other purposes, as follows:

1. $500" - "Special supply allowance on behalf of Herbert S. Anker," April 1 through September 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Aaron Novick, Dean of the Graduate School.

2. $28,754 - "Genetics of Visual Pigments," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Frederick W. Munz, Professor of Biology.

3. $21,454 - "Localization of TRNA Genes on Drosophila Chromosomes," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Donald R. Hague, Assistant Professor of Biology.

4. $33,238 - "Migration and Differentiation of Neural Crest Cells," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. James A. Weston, Associate Professor of Biology.

5. $107,555 - "Maturational Reform and Rural Delinquency," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Kenneth Polk, Professor of Sociology.

6. $16,107 - "Kinetic Analysis of Enzyme Catalysis," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Sidney A. Bernhard, Research Associate, Institute of Molecular Biology.

7. $25,299 - "Genetic Control Systems in Development of Drosophila," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. John H. Postlethwait, Assistant Professor of Biology.

8. $28,235 - "Biomedical Sciences Support Grant," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Aaron Novick, Dean of the Graduate School.

9. $16,973 - "Mechanism of Chemotaxis in Bacteria," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Frederick Dahlquist, Assistant Professor of Chemistry.


11. $44,341 - "Continued support of Research Training in Comparative Physiology," July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Graham Hoyle, Professor of Biology.
12. $69,201 - "Continued support of a training grant in Biological Sciences," July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. John C. Fentress, Associate Professor of Biology and Psychology.

13. $78,527 - "Continuation of Undergraduate Training in Evaluative Research," July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Michael G. Saslow, Associate Professor of the School of Community Service and Public Affairs.

Gifts to the Library:

Mrs. L. A. Isaac  Correspondence, working files, and manuscripts from the files of her husband, Leo A. Isaac, from Mrs. Leo A. Isaac, Portland. The gift is valued at $400.

S. Malarkey  Approximately 250 titles from the library of Mr. Stoddard Malarkey, Eugene. The books are primarily recreational reading and books on New England and the Pacific Northwest. The gift is valued at $294.75.

J. B. Toelken  Thirty titles, original publications and reprints from American folk tradition, from Mr. J. Barre Toelken, Eugene. The gift is valued at $250.05.

Gifts to the University of Oregon Library from the following donors:

Museum of Art:

T. O. Ballinger  Original watercolor painting by Thomas O. Ballinger, from Mr. Ballinger, Eugene. The painting is entitled "City Plan," and is valued at $300.

Dr. & Mrs. R. W. Brooks  Three pieces of antique Korean pottery, valued at $4,500, from Dr. and Mrs. Robert W. Brooks.

University of Oregon Dental School


U. S. Public Health Service  Grant of $15,451 from the U. S. Public Health Service, Bethesda, Maryland, for a research project entitled, "Fructose Lethality of Dental Plaque Streptococci," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Howard R. Creamer, Associate Professor of Microbiology.
Scholarships & Fellowships
Gifts totaling $6,299 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

American Business Women's Association,
Timberline Chapter, Portland $ 200.00
The American Professional Practice Association,
New York City 2,000.00
Drain Plywood Company, Drain 333.00
Leukemia Association of Oregon, Inc., Portland 266.00
Marion-Polk County Medical Society Woman's Auxiliary, Salem 900.00
St. Elizabeth Hospital Auxiliary, Baker 400.00
University of Oregon Medical School Alumni Association, Portland 2,000.00
Mrs. Harold Wendel, Portland 200.00

American Cancer Society, Oregon Division, Inc.
Grants totaling $31,250 from the American Cancer Society, Oregon Division, Inc., Portland, for research and other purposes, as follows:

1. $8,650 - "Determination of Polyamines by Fluorescamine and Radio-immunoassay Methodologies in Blood, Urine, and Spinal Fluid in Health and Disease," May 1 through December 31, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Robert A. Campbell, Professor of Pediatrics.

2. $11,600 - "The Study of Tumor Immunity by Investigating the Specific Immunological Suppression and Stimulation of a Transplantable Tumor," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Denis R. Burger, Assistant Professor of Microbiology.

3. $11,000 - "To determine the Diagnostic, Prognostic and Therapeutic Significance of Lymphocyte Subpopulation in Recticuloendothelia Malignancy," July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Bernard Pirofsky, Head of the Division of Immunology and Allergy.

American Kennel Club
Grant of $7,500 from the American Kennel Club, New York City, for research entitled, "Canine Semen and Its Long Term Preservation," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Stephen W. J. Seager, Assistant Professor of Animal Care and Surgery.

Beta Sigma Phi
Gift of $700.00 from Beta Sigma Phi, Astoria, for cancer research, under the direction of Dean C. N. Holman.

C. D. Britton
Gift of two female Basenji dogs, valued at $300, from Miss Connie D. Britton, Portland, for use in the Animal Care Center, under the direction of Mr. Allen Rogers, Director of the Animal Care Center.
R. P. Burns  Gift of $120 from Dr. Robert P. Burns, Portland, "to purchase film
and fluorescein for retinal photographing in the Department of
Ophthalmology," under the direction of Dr. Kenneth Swan, Professor
and Chairman of the Department.

L. Christensen  Gift of $600 from Dr. Leonard Christensen, Portland, "for support
of various programs in the Department of Ophthalmology," under
the direction of Dr. Kenneth Swan, Professor and Chairman of the
Department of Ophthalmology.

Paul A. and
Lisa M. Cibis
Charitable
Trust  Grant of $200 from the Paul A. and Lisa M. Cibis Charitable Trust,
through the St. Louis Union Trust Company, St. Louis, Missouri,
"for departmental expenditures under the direction of Dr. Andrea B.
Tongue," under the direction of Dr. Kenneth Swan, Chairman of the
Department of Ophthalmology.

The Collins
Foundation  Grant of $9,500 from The Collins Foundation, Portland, "in support
of a new faculty position in Pediatric Clinical Pharmacology," July 1,
1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. William
Riker, Professor and Chairman of the Department of Pharmacology.

Columbia Region
Association of
Governments  Grant of $3,750 from the Columbia Region Association of Governments,
Portland, "in support of a study for a Metropolitan Crime Laboratory
Facility," March 1, 1973, through February 28, 1974, under the direc-
tion of Dr. Wilbert R. Todd, Professor of Biochemistry.

G. J. Delorit  Gift of $150 from Dr. Gary J. Delorit, Lake Oswego, "to be added to
the Library Fund of the Department of Otolaryngology," under the
direction of Dr. David DeWeese, Chairman of the Department of
Otolaryngology.

Good Samaritan
Hospital  Grant of $500 from the Good Samaritan Hospital, Portland, to be used
for research in kidney transplant, under the direction of Dr. Clarence
Hodges, Head of the Division of Urology.

Mrs. A. Graham  Gift of 96 small pine trees from Mrs. Arthur Graham, Portland, to
the Grounds Maintenance Department. The gift is valued at $240.

The Hervin
Company  Grant of $900 from The Hervin Company, Tualatin, for animal care
research, under the direction of Mr. Allen Rogers, Director of the
Animal Care Center.

W. C. Lobitz,
Jr.  Gift of $118.69 from Dr. Walter C. Lobitz, Jr., "for the unrestricted
use of the Department of Dermatology." under the direction of
Dr. Walter C. Lobitz, Jr., Chairman, Department of Dermatology.

Millicent
Foundation  Grant of $7,500 from the Millicent Foundation, Vancouver, Washington,
"in support of a cancer research project," August 1, 1973, through
July 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Dagmar Bartos, Assistant
Professor of Pediatrics.

New Eyes for the
Needy, Inc.  Grant of $500 from New Eyes for the Needy, Inc., Short Hills, New
Jersey, "to purchase prescription glasses and artificial eyes for the
needy patients," under the direction of Dr. Kenneth Swan, Professor
and Chairman, Department of Ophthalmology.
Oregon State Health Division

Grants totaling $8,904 from the Oregon State Health Division, Portland, for research and other purposes as follows:

1. $6,000 - "In support of a prenatal diagnosis in the Crippled Children's Division," June 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Victor D. Menashe, Director, Crippled Children's Division.

2. $2,904 - "To provide supplementary support for the Regional Service project in Eugene which provides services to crippled children through the Oregon State Health Division, June 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Victor Menashe.

Ortho Pharmaceutical Corporation

Grant of $250 from the Ortho Pharmaceutical Corporation, Raritan, New Jersey, "in support of travel expenses for resident doctors to attend the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists meeting," under the direction of Dr. Ralph Benson, Chairman, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology.

Parke-Davis

Gift of $100 from Parke-Davis, Detroit, Michigan, "to allay travel expense of resident doctors to annual meeting of American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists," under the direction of Dr. Ralph Benson, Professor and Chairman, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology.

The Pendleton Junior Chamber of Commerce

Gift of $750 from The Pendleton Junior Chamber of Commerce, Pendleton, to be used in the Crippled Children's Division, under the direction of Dr. Victor D. Menashe, Director, Crippled Children's Division.

B. Pirofsky & E. J. Bardana, Jr.

Gift of $200 from Dr. Bernard Pirofsky and Dr. Emil J. Bardana, Jr., Portland, for "Leukocytic Sarcoma Research," under the direction of Dr. Arthur Seaman, Head of the Division of Hematology, and Dr. James Linman, Director, Osborn Leukemia Center.

Portland Academy of Medicine

Gift of $1,500 from the Portland Academy of Medicine, Portland, for the Medical School Library, under the direction of Miss Margaret Hughes, Professor and Librarian.

Portland Federation of Women's Organizations

Gift of $292 from the Portland Federation of Women's Organizations, Portland, in support of Doernbecher Hospital, under the direction of Dr. Michael Baird, Medical Director, Hospitals and Clinics.

U. S. Air Force Department

Grant of $23,500 from the U. S. Air Force Department, Mt. Rainier, Maryland, for research entitled, "Speech Characteristics as Indices of Attitude, Mood and Motivational State," May 1, 1973, through December 12, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Arthur N. Wiens, Professor of Medical Psychology.
Grants totaling $629,466 from the U. S. Public Health Service, Bethesda, Maryland, for research and other purposes as follows:

1. $2,215 - "In further support of a Regional Service Center in the Eugene area to provide services to crippled children," July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Victor D. Menashe, Director, Crippled Children's Division, and Dr. Michael D. Baird, Medical Director and Administrator, Hospitals and Clinics.

2. $5,304 - "Collaborative Studies on Coronary Artery Surgery," June 1, 1973, through November 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Shabbudin H. Rahimtoola, Professor of Medicine.

3. $16,915 - "Investigation of Agents Which Damage the Ear," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Jack A. Vernon, Professor of Otolaryngology.

4. $28,207 - "Synthetic Activity of Ocular Neuroepithelia," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Lynette Feeney, Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology.

5. $51,288 - "Effect of Function of Grafts and Implants of Collagen," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. William W. Krippaehne, Professor and Chairman, Department of Surgery.

6. $35,284 - "The Effect of Alcohol on Membrane Transport," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. John T. Van Bruggen, Professor of Biochemistry.

7. $30,753 - "Control of Gene Expression in Differentiating Cells," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. David Kabat, Assistant Professor of Biochemistry.

8. $1,000 - "In support of a postdoctoral fellowship supply allowance for Dr. James A. Rademacher, in the Department of Anatomy," April 9, 1973 through April 8, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Robert L. Bacon, Professor of Anatomy.

9. $29,300 - "Rheological Behavior of Erythrocyte Suspensions," May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Geoffrey V. F. Seaman, Associate Professor Neurology.

10. $61,980 - "Biochemical Cytology of Metabolic Eye Diseases," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Robert P. Burns, Professor of Ophthalmology.

11. $75,730 - "Steroidal Regulation of Active Sodium Transport," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. George A. Porter, Associate Professor and Head, Section of Renology.
12. $45,189 - "Electrochemistry of Cell–Plasma–Particle Interactions," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Geoffrey V. F. Seaman, Associate Professor of Neurology.

13. $18,121 - "Neuroendocrine and Thyroid Physiology," April 1, 1973, through March 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Monte A. Greer, Professor and Head of the Division of Endocrinology.

14. $30,735 - "Effects of Emotion and Cold on Coronary Circulation," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. William A. Neill, Associate Professor of Cardiology.

15. $97,445 - "Mechanisms of Oxygen Metabolism," June 1, 1973, through May 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Howard S. Mason, Professor of Biochemistry.

UOMS Advancement Fund  Gift of $9,900 from the University of Oregon Medical School Advancement Fund, Portland, in support of a research project entitled: "Studies on Synovial Fluid," February 1, 1973, through January 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. William S. Fletcher, Professor of Surgery.

UOMS Alumni Association  Gift of $867 from the University of Oregon Medical School Alumni Association, Portland, to purchase books, periodicals or supplies, under the direction of Miss Margaret E. Hughes, Librarian.

Wyeth Laboratories  Gift of $150 from Wyeth Laboratories, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, "to provide assistance for staff members to attend professional meetings," under the direction of Dr. Ralph Benson, Chairman, Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology.

Portland State University  Gifts totaling $32,651.01 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

- Albina Page Fund, Salem  $ 1,505.00
- American Business Women's Association, Portland  300.00
- Cash Western University, Cleveland, Ohio  334.00
- Cleveland High School, Portland  200.00
- Cockerline Memorial Trust, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Salem  334.00
- College Entrance Examination Board, New York City  751.00
- Commissioner of Baseball, New York City  733.33
- Confederated Tribes & Bands, Yakima Indian Nation, Toppenish, Washington  233.34
- Cummins Engine Co., Inc., Columbus, Indiana  400.00
- Office of the Grand Commissioner of Education, Elks Lodges, Memphis, Tennessee  125.00
- Georgia Pacific Foundation, Portland  500.00
- The M. W. Prince Hall Grand Lodge F. & A. M. of Oregon, Inc., Portland  150.00
C. T. & Esther Hansen and Knights of Columbus, Grants Pass $100.00
Intermediate Education District - Douglas County, Roseburg 168.00
International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, Washington, D.C. 333.34
The Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities, Cambridge, Massachusetts 692.67
Mark Guild for Retarded Children, Portland 188.00
Lions Club, McMinnville 133.33
Medford Senior High School, Medford 132.00
Miss America Pageant Headquarters, Atlantic City, New Jersey 1,000.00
Oregon Congress of Parents & Teachers, Inc., Portland 332.00
Pacific Power and Light Company, Portland 400.00
Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 533.00
P. E. O. Sisterhood, Oregon State Chapter, Corvallis 600.00
P. E. O. Sisterhood, Portland 172.00
Mr. Lloyd V. Porter, Portland 500.00
Portland Rose Festival Association, Portland 325.00
St. Andrews Society of Oregon, Portland 200.00
Smith River Lumber Co., Inc., Drain 333.00
U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Anadarko Area Office, Anadarko, Oklahoma 636.00
U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Billings, Montana 2,800.00
U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Blackfeet Indian Agency, Browning, Montana 5,768.00
U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Everett, Washington 2,066.00
U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Juneau Area Office, Juneau, Alaska 1,000.00
U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Navajo Area Office, Window Rock, Arizona 1,703.00
U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Portland 3,327.00
U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Sacramento Area Office, Sacramento, California 1,500.00
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado 762.00
Xerox Corporation and Mr. Robert L. Racouillat, Portland 1,400.00

**Anonymous Donor**
Gift of $254 from anonymous donors, for social work gifts, under the direction of Mr. Guido Pinamonti, Assistant Dean, School of Social Work.

**Crown Zellerbach Corporation**
Gift of $100 from Crown Zellerbach Corporation, Portland, to be used for the Environmental Education Center, under the direction of Dr. Harold C. Jorgensen, Associate Professor of Education.

**Gerber Advertising Agency**
Gift of 69 periodical volumes of Standard Rate and Data Services covering the year 1972, valued at $172.50, from the Gerber Advertising Agency, Portland, for use in the library under the direction of Dr. Frank Rodgers, Director of the Library.
Meeting #411-71

Mrs. D. Humphrey  Gift of 20 volumes of Colliers Encyclopedia, 15 volumes of the Works of Dickens, 35 additional volumes in areas of literature and history, and fifteen maps issued by the National Geographic Society, from Mrs. Dily Humprey, Portland. The gift is valued at $160.00.

Miss M. Leslie  Gift of 36 periodical volumes in the area of special education from Miss Madge Leslie, Portland. The gift is valued at $108.

Manning Bequest  Request of miscellaneous items valued at $1,236 from the estate of Horace M. Manning. The gifts are primarily equipment and reference material to be used in the Department of Psychology.

Murphy Company  Grant of $125 from the Murphy Company, Portland, to be used for the Environmental Education Center, under the direction of Dr. Harold C. Jorgensen, Associate Professor of Education.

Oregon Mathematics Education Council  Subgrants totaling $41,663 from the Oregon Mathematics Education Council, Salem, for research and other purposes as follows:

1. $21,668 - "Program for Secondary Teachers of General Mathematics," May 1, 1973, through July 30, 1974, under the direction of Mrs. Marjorie Enneking, Assistant Professor of Mathematics.

2. $19,995 - "To provide support for a summer workshop designed to develop the capabilities and leadership of mathematics 'enthusiasts' in the mathematics program in two areas of the Portland School District," May 1, 1973, through September 30, 1974, under the direction of Mrs. Mildred L. Bennett, Associate Professor of Mathematics.

Mrs. R. Platt  Gift of 172 monographic volumes, together with pamphlet material in the areas of science and social science, valued at $175, from Mrs. Robert Platt, Portland.

State of Alaska  Grant of $7,000 from the State of Alaska, Department of Health and Social Services, "to provide support of an evaluation of the Residential School Ombudsman Demonstration Project for Alaska's Department of Health and Social Services by Portland State University's Regional Research Institute on Youth Development and Delinquency," April 25, 1973, through July 15, 1973, under the direction of Mr. Arthur Emlen, Professor of Social Work.

State of Oregon  Grant of $38,029 from the State of Oregon, Children's Services Division, "for continuation of a Learning Center within the Albina Multi-Service Center," July 1, 1973 through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Mrs. Kay Jernigan Toran, Assistant Professor of Social Work.

U. S. Dept. of Agriculture  Grant of $4,470 from the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Portland, for a research project entitled, "Correlation Between Insolation of a 'Female' broom and Douglas-fir Dwarf Mistletoe Seed Reproduction," May 1, 1973, through December 31, 1975, under the direction of Mr. Robert O. Tinnin, Assistant Professor of Biology.
**U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare**


**U.S. Public Health Service**

Grant of $37,197 from the U.S. Public Health Service, Rockville, Maryland, for research entitled, "Continuing Education for Social Work in Mental Health," July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Miss Sonja C. Matison, Assistant Professor of Social Work.

**Oregon College of Education**

Scholarships & Fellowships

Gifts totaling $18,930.35 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship Fund or Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Force R. O. T. C. Scholarship Fund, Salem</td>
<td>$171.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Union High School Girl's League, Albany</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albina Page Fund, Salem</td>
<td>4,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Business Women's Association, Milwaukee</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Legion Auxiliary, Salem</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astoria Business and Professional Women's Club, Astoria</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandon Community Scholarship Fund, Bandon</td>
<td>185.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton Lodge No. 100, A. F. &amp; A. M., Beaverton</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise Cascade Corporation, Boise, Idaho</td>
<td>1,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Carpenter Foundation, through School District No. 6, Central Point</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. K. Dart Scholarship Fund, Eugene</td>
<td>166.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas High School, Dillard</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Plywood Company, Drain</td>
<td>666.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Lodge No. 1869, Condon</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Lodge No. 2105, Newport</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Lodge No. 1814, Prineville</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Lodge No. 1972, Sweet Home</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Lodge No. 1664, Toledo</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia-Pacific Foundation, Portland</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Mission Board, Southern Baptist Convention, Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King, Jr., Scholarship of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>513.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis Club, Lebanon</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis Club, Newport</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln County Foundation, Newport</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Brotherhood College Aid Fund, Minneapolis, Minnesota, Minnesota</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Club, McMinnville</td>
<td>666.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Oregon Scholarship Pageant, Seaside</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific High School Student Body, Port Orford</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Palau Legislature Scholarship Committee, Palau, Western Caroline Islands $1,000.00
P.E.O. Sisterhood, Salem Area Council, Portland 250.00
Pepsi Cola Bottling Company, Portland 100.00
Ridgefield Educational Association, Ridgefield, Washington 100.00
Smith River Lumber Company, Drain 1,166.00
Burt K. Snyder Educational Foundation, through the First National Bank, Klamath Falls 540.00
Soroptimist Club, Prineville 200.00
South Santiam Educational and Research Project, through Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis 666.00
Trinity Covenant Church, Salem 200.00
The United Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 400.00
Trust Division, U.S. National Bank, Portland 235.00
Work/College Scholarship, through the U.S. National Bank, Portland 115.00
Flora M. Von Der Ahe School Fund, through the U.S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland 500.00
Yakima Dalles Dam Minors Trust Fund, through the National Bank of Commerce, Seattle, Washington 120.00
Yakima Indian Nation, Toppenish, Washington 866.67
Yamhill-Carlton High School Parent-Teacher Association, Carlton 165.00

Joint Committee for the Humanities
Subgrant of $8,386 through the Joint Committee for the Humanities, Portland, for conducting a three-day convocation on "Man and the Land: Environmental Perspectives of the Native American in Early Oregon," March 1, 1973, through September 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Ronald L. Chatham, Professor of Social Science. These funds are available from the National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D.C.

Lincoln County School District
Grant of $1,997 from the Lincoln County School District, Newport, to provide a class for the teaching staff of Lincoln County School District. The class will be called Ed 597 "Psychology of Teaching Reading," April 17, 1973, through June 9, 1973, under the direction of Mrs. Bonnie Young, Associate Professor of Education.

Marion Intermediate Education District
Grant of $2,000 from the Marion Intermediate Education District, Salem, to conduct a summer workshop entitled "Understanding State and Local Government," March 9, 1973, through August 17, 1973, under the direction of Mr. Leland Hess, Professor of Political Science.

Salem School District 24J
Grant of $6,578 from the Salem School District 24J, Salem, to fund a summer program entitled, "Salem-Oregon College of Education Secondary Reading Institute," February 15, 1973, through September 14, 1973, under the direction of Mr. Harry C. Geil, Assistant Professor of Education.
Grants totaling $9,974 from the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C., for research and the following purposes:

1. $2,221 - "For traveling expense for faculty and students to attend a two week training program at a drug education center," July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Donald H. Duncan, Chairman of the Education and Psychology Department.

2. $7,753 - "Provides for a meeting in several different states of parents, teachers of the deaf, rehabilitation personnel working with the deaf, adult deaf and significant others who are upgrading services to deaf individuals," April 1, 1973, through December 31, 1973, under the direction of Mr. Richard E. Walker, Associate Professor of Education.

**Southern Oregon College**

**Scholarships & Fellowships**

Gifts totaling $1,144.33 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

- Ashland Lions Club Scholarship, Ashland $ 200.00
- Associated Teachers District #6, Central Point 136.00
- Baseball - Office of the Commissioner, New York City 233.33
- Criswell Scholarship Fund, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland 500.00
- Kamehameha Schools, Honolulu, Hawaii 140.00
- Richardson Elementary Parent-Teacher Association, Scholarship, Central Point 135.00

**Dr. E. McGill**

Gift of a collection of 50 bound volumes and 518 unbound business education journals from Dr. Esby McGill, Ashland. The gift is valued at $1,387.

**Mrs. L. Perozzi**

Gift of $479.16 from Mrs. Louise Perozzi, Medford, to be added to the Dean's Loan Fund.

**U. S. Dept. of Justice**

Grant of $15,000 from the U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., to be used for loans in the Law Enforcement Program, during the summer of 1973, under the direction of Mr. Ivan R. Polk, Chairman of the Law Enforcement Department.

**Mrs. G. Westgaard**

Gift of 22 volumes on the travels in Russia, valued at $256, from Mrs. Gloria Westgaard. The gift was purchased from funds donated in memory of her late husband, Mr. John Westgaard.
Eastern Oregon College

Scholarships & Fellowships

Gifts totaling $6,623.67 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

- Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., New York City $ 100.00
- Baker County School District 30J, Unity 150.00
- Carpenter Foundation Scholarship, through Medford Senior High School, Medford 133.00
- Columbia Power Cooperative Association, Monument 100.00
- Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, Warm Springs 136.00
- Burnt River Booster Club, Unity 125.00
- Kamehameha Schools Organizations, Honolulu, Hawaii 473.00
- Soroptimist Club, La Grande 173.00
- Mildred Lilster Scholarship Trust, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Medford 116.67
- Oregon Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., Portland 332.00
- Oregon State Society Daughters of the American Revolution, Salem 173.00
- U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Aberdeen Area Office, Aberdeen, South Dakota 1,584.00
- U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Juneau Area Office, Juneau, Alaska 2,000.00
- U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Warm Springs Agency, Warm Springs 682.00
- U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland 346.00

Howard Bequest

Bequest of $1,730.67 from the estate of Mr. Charles A. Howard, deceased, Salem, to be added to the Emergency Student Loan Fund.

Division of Continuing Education

Society of Real Estate Appraisers

Gift of $534.43 from the Society of Real Estate Appraisers, Portland, for the unrestricted use of the Division of Continuing Education for staff development.

Teaching Research Division

Beaverton School District No. 48

Grant of $350 from the Beaverton School District No. 48, Beaverton, "for the evaluation of three Beaverton Problem Intervention classes to determine effectiveness of classroom teachers, class organization and progress of children," May 8 through May 15, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Harold D. Fredericks, Research Professor (Project Director).

Oregon State Dept. of Education

Grant of $10,000 from the Oregon State Department of Education, "to provide consultant and supervisory services to Department of Education's Total Communication Research Project," November 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. James H. Beaird, Research Professor (Project Director).
Grant of $22,140 from the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C., "to include 14 more states in the 3-day training institutes for Departments of Education personnel - training them to select monitors and benefit from third-party evaluations of Title VI projects in their home states," under the direction of Dr. Victor Baldwin, Research Professor.

Centralized Activities

Grant of $18,000 from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Washington, D. C., as a general support grant for KOAP Radio, Portland, and KOAC Radio, Corvallis, May 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974, under the direction of Mr. Luke Roberts, Director, State of Oregon Division, and Mr. Robert C. Mudd, KOAC Station Manager, Oregon Educational and Public Broadcasting Service.

PERSONNEL

Designation of Dr. Paul S. Holbo, Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, as Acting Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, effective May 1, 1973, indefinite tenure, 12-months' service, at an annual salary rate of $22,212, for the period in which he serves as Acting Dean.

The funds required for the salary increase are available within the budget of the College of Liberal Arts.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Adjournment & Reconvening Date

At 3:35 P.M., President Layman adjourned the meeting until August 27, 1973, on which date the Board will reconvene at 10:30 A.M. in the Oregon State University Marine Science Center meeting room, Newport, Oregon.
Introduction

At the February 20, 1973 meeting of the academic affairs committee of the board of higher education, there was an extended discussion of tenure in the state system of higher education, centering around a document prepared for the committee by the board’s office, entitled "Tenure - A Preliminary Discussion Document."

The committee received testimony concerning the position vis-à-vis tenure set forth in the foregoing document, from the following:

- Spokesmen from the following faculty groups:
  - Interinstitutional faculty senate
  - State federation of the American Association of University Professors
  - Oregon State Employees Association

- One or two faculty members from state system institutions who spoke either independent of any organization, or from the vantage point of an institutional faculty representative.

- A number of presidents of state system colleges and universities.

- Members of the board of higher education.

A summary of the testimony received and of the subsequent discussion by the academic affairs committee is presented in the "Report of the Meeting of the Committee on Academic Affairs," dated February 20, 1973, a copy of which is available from the board’s office upon request.

The discussion document on tenure, cited above, presented:

- A definition of tenure
- A discussion of the background out of which tenure emerged and the factors giving rise to its development
- The purposes tenure is designed to serve
- Some alternatives that have been suggested in various quarters for supplanting tenure

Recommendations for shortening the administration of tenure in the Oregon State System of Higher Education

A brief discussion of the following aspects of tenure that the board's office wished to discuss with the board's academic affairs committee before developing recommendations concerning them:

- Regular part-time faculty employment conditions
- Financial exigency
- Probationary period
- Nontenured faculty member - request for statement of reasons for nonreappointment

Conspicuously absent both from the recommendations contained in the discussion document on tenure and from the list of topics presented therein without recommendation is the subject of administrative tenure. This omission was deliberate. The board's office feels that the complexity and importance of the question of tenure as it relates to faculty members, as distinguished from administrative officers, warrants separate consideration by the board's committee of these two aspects of tenure. Consequently, a consideration of administrative tenure is left to a document subsequently to be presented to the academic affairs committee, following action on the general issue of tenure and the faculty.

February 20 Action of the Academic Affairs Committee

In presenting to the academic affairs committee the discussion document on tenure at its February 20 meeting, the board's office stated that it did not expect the committee to take action on the recommendations of the board's office at that meeting. The recommendations - indeed, the entire document - were presented only for the purpose of giving direction to the testimony to be heard and to the subsequent discussion by the committee.

Hence, there was no formal action by the board's committee on academic affairs as to the recommendations contained in the discussion document. But out of the testimony taken by the academic affairs committee on that occasion (February 20) and out of the ensuing discussion of tenure by the committee, the board's office drew several inferences as to the committee's views, as follows:

- That the committee accepted the general premise of the discussion document, namely, that tenure, in principle, is a desirable policy, and if properly administered, is a sounder approach to the achievement of the purposes tenure is designed to serve than any of the alternative approaches which have been suggested from time to time to supplant tenure.
That the principal weaknesses in the existing state system tenure program arise out of policy and administrative shortcomings that can be effectively corrected by: (1) improved board policies relating to tenure, forming the basis for better administration, and (2) improved institutional administration of tenure policies.

That among the specific aspects of present tenure policies that are of special concern to the committee are:

- the susceptibility of the present policy statement in the board's Administrative Rules to the interpretation that the achievement of tenure by faculty courses early in the individual's career, effective with the fourth year, and almost automatically. It was suggested by various members of the committee that the Administrative Rules ought to be changed to clarify that the minimum period of service required for consideration for tenure normally ought to be five years or the professional equivalent thereof.

- lack of clarity in present policies as to (1) whether tenure is accorded an individual faculty member is system-wide or institution-wide, and (2) the extent of the freedom of institutions to terminate employment of tenured faculty in the face of reduction in or elimination of programs.

- the too-brief probationary period in some instances.

- the lack of provision in the present Administrative Rules or in institutional regulations for guidelines which will assure that institutional faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure policies will accord sufficient flexibility in institutional staffing policies to permit the continuing inflow of new faculty in a period when the enrollment stabilization of enrollments and reduced faculty turnover threaten seriously to reduce that inflow, with all of the adverse implications such a condition has for institutional dynamics.

Members of the committee expressed the view that assurance of flexibility in faculty appointment and retention policies to permit the maintenance of a continuing inflow of new faculty is an essential requirement of an acceptable tenure program.

- the need for periodic review and evaluation of faculty who have acquired tenure.

Purpose of This Present Document

This present document rests upon a foundation consisting of: (1) the broad base laid in the tenure discussion document prepared by the board's office on the basis for the February 20 discussion of tenure by the academic affairs committee of the board, including the board's office recommendations for needed changes in tenure policies and tenure administration, (2) the testimony presented by various faculty group representatives and institution heads at the February 20 meeting, and (3) the inferences drawn by the board's office as to the views of the members of the academic affairs committee as to tenure in the state system of higher education, (4) testimony given by faculty and administrative personnel at the May 22 meeting of the board when this present document was briefly before the board for a preliminary hearing.

This present report is a slightly modified version of the May 22 document as it was then. It is now presented to the academic affairs committee of the board for further discussion, with the expectation that the committee will wish to transmit it, as amended in accordance with the wishes of the committee, to the board of higher education at its July 23 meeting in Portland.

It is the purpose of this present document to present for consideration by the academic affairs committee: (1) a statement of the objectives of an effective tenure system, and (2) a draft of the proposed Administrative Rules which, if adopted, would, in the judgment of the board's office, give the state system a program of tenure consistent with the objectives of an effective tenure system as defined hereinafter in the forepart of this present document.
Objectives of an Effective Tenure Plan

Our purpose in here setting forth a statement of the specific objectives of a sound tenure plan is two-fold:

- To provide a guide in terms of which a set of administrative rules governing tenure in the state system of higher education can be developed.

- To provide a point of reference in terms of which the administrative rules relating to tenure in the state system, which are proposed for consideration by the board's academic affairs committee in the next section of this present document, may be evaluated.

Predominant Purposes of Tenure

Tenure developed out of important societal needs; and, although the tenure principle confers undeniable personal benefits upon the faculty member, tenure developed and is defended because of the benefits that it bestows upon society. For tenure exists for two principal reasons:

- To permit society (in the present case, Oregon) to attract into the academic profession men and women of ability and of independent judgment by protecting the independence of the professorial role through assurance of a reasonable security of tenure in that office — following an appropriate probationary period in which the professor is required to prove himself.

Able professors prize academic freedom, which is a shorthand way of saying they value: (1) the freedom that is theirs in research and other scholarly endeavors to follow where the truth leads and to publish the results "subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties," and (b) freedom in the classroom to discuss their subjects without fear of dismissal should they "criticize or advocate change in accepted theories or widely held beliefs."

- To assure society the benefit of "honest judgment and independent criticism which otherwise might be withheld because of fear of offending a dominant social group or transient social attitude."

Although not unique in the job security it provides professors in its institutions (judges, public school teachers, state and federal civil service personnel have similar forms of job security), the state system is dependent upon the job security provisions of tenure for the achievement of its objectives to a degree that is not true of most other state and federal agencies which provide similar job security for their employees. For society's purpose in establishing colleges and universities is principally the preservation and advancement of knowledge and it is clear that for a number of reasons —

society's purposes could not be fully achieved without employment security for its teachers. For instance:

- Freedom of thought, freedom of inquiry, and freedom of expression — all indispensable to the creation and maintenance of that intellectual ferment that is the distinguishing characteristic of any fine college or university — are made more likely when those faculty who have demonstrated adequately their merit and competence may be assured of reasonable job continuity as a protection against any possible recriminations resulting in the dismissal for such illegitimate reasons as the expression of "dangerous" or "undesirable" ideas.

- The long-term institutional commitment to the faculty member which job continuity under tenure represents may, in some instances, be the means of encouraging faculty to engage in administrative, faculty, or student-related activities, which, although not likely to enhance the faculty member's prestige or standing among his colleagues nationwide in his chosen subject matter field, are vital to the institution's effective operation. Or, as the Utah study suggested, the institution's long-term commitment to faculty, which tenure represents, may call forth reciprocal long-term agreements on the part of interested faculty willing under these conditions "to pursue careers in specialized technical fields which are essential components of contemporary university programs of instruction and research but which have no ready counterparts in private or public employment opportunities."

(That tenure may have, in some instances, been the means of protecting incompetence or carelessness is more a criticism of the administration of tenure than of the tenure principle itself, and we have, in the proposed administrative rules set forth in the next section of this document, sought to establish policies which will assure that the administration of tenure in the state system will call forth the best efforts of faculty — tenured and non-tenured.)

Elements of a Sound Tenure Plan

The foregoing being the dominant purposes of tenure, what are the specific objectives that the Administrative Rules Governing Tenure must meet if they are to protect academic freedom, maintain the integrity of the academic profession, and assure the state system continuing faculty flexibility and growth in capacity to perform the functions for which the state has created its colleges and universities?

They must:

1. Provide for a clear assignment of responsibility for the selection, appointment, assignment, supervision, evaluation, promotion, and where necessary, termination of appointment of faculty.
2. Provide for a careful selection of faculty.

3. Provide for notices of appointment to faculty that are clear, complete, and unambiguous as to the terms and conditions of employment.

4. Provide a clear definition of tenure, including such matters as whether tenure is system-wide in its application to a given faculty member, or only institution-wide, and the conditions under which institutions may, through reduction in size of programs or elimination of programs, terminate employment of tenured faculty.

5. Provide a clear statement of the conditions under which tenure may be attained, making clear the fact that the acquisition of tenure is not automatic, but is achieved by a defined process through which the institution grants to faculty who have proven themselves during a probationary period, the assurance that they will not thereafter be separated from the institution except for cause as defined in the board's Administrative Rules, financial exigency, resignation, or retirement.

6. Provide for those faculty who are to be considered for tenure a probationary period of sufficient length to permit a reasoned judgment to be made of the likely potential of the faculty member.

7. Provide for the establishment of appropriate evaluative criteria in terms of which faculty are to be evaluated for (a) renewal of appointment during the probationary period, (b) promotion, (c) tenure.

8. Provide that the institutions shall assure, through planned systematic programs on a continuing basis (e.g., discussion sessions, seminars), that the various administrative and faculty personnel involved in the faculty evaluation process - particularly in relation to tenure - will develop common (similar) understandings as to the proper application of the evaluative criteria in making tenure recommendations at the several administrative levels (i.e., department, school, institution).

9. Provide that upon appointment, the faculty member shall be informed in writing of the evaluative processes that are to be applied in connection with decisions as to reappointment, promotion, tenure.

10. Identify and define the bases upon which a faculty member's employment may be terminated (e.g., termination for cause, financial exigency, resignation, retirement).

11. Provide an effective judicial process which will assure that faculty members charged with any infractions defined in the board's Administrative Rules or institutional regulations as possible evidence of cause for the application of sanctions shall have the benefits of academic due process and thus be protected from arbitrary, capricious action based on ideological, political, or other indefensible grounds.

12. Provide for a periodic, systematic evaluation of tenured faculty members, and for development of an appropriate systematic plan of individual improvement where such is indicated.

13. Provide for the establishment of organized faculty career support programs in the institutions designed to give faculty assistance in their continuing efforts to improve teaching and related scholarly activities.

14. Provide for a continuing inflow of new faculty, despite stabilizing student enrollments and reduced faculty turnover.
Proposed Administrative Rules
Relating to Selection, Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty

The board's office presents below the proposed administrative rules governing selection, appointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty in the state system of higher education.

To provide the board with a comprehensive view of the changes being proposed in the Administrative Rules and the reasons therefore, we present below:

- the current Administrative Rules with any recommended deletions therefrom enclosed in parentheses, and any proposed additions underscored;
- below each of the proposed administrative rules is a brief explanation of the rationale for the changes proposed.

In some instances we have proposed no change in an existing administrative rule, but we have provided an explanation of the changes that one or more of the faculty organizations or other elements within the state system would like to see made. Our purpose is to provide the board with the fullest possible information as to the issues which relate to each of the proposed administrative rules.

The numbered items refer to the numbers of the items in the section "Elements of a Sound Tenure System," pp. 6-8 of this present document.

Proposed Administrative Rules

Items 1. Assignment of responsibility for selection, appointment, promotion, transfers, suspensions, terminations.

2. The chancellor is authorized to approve, upon recommendation of the institutional executive, the selection, appointment, promotion, salaries, transfers, suspensions and terminations of appointments of deans of schools or colleges.

3. The chancellor is authorized to approve, upon recommendation of the institutional executive (or agency head in the case of the agencies appended to the board's office), appointments, transfers, resignations, leaves of absence, changes in tenure status, promotion in rank, establishment of emeritus status, fixation of salaries, or terminations of appointments of members of the faculty and other employees of the institution and component divisions, except as provided in item 1 and 2 immediately above, or in AR 41.010; or the chancellor may delegate full responsibility for the foregoing personnel actions to the institutional executive or agency head.

4. The chancellor is authorized to select, appoint, promote, fix the salaries and tenure status of, grant leaves to, transfer, suspend or terminate the employment of all the employees in the board's office, except as provided in item 1 immediately above, or in AR 41.010.

11.210 (Personnel and) Budget Adjustments (See also AR 12.160)

The chancellor is authorized to approve the following (personnel and) budget adjustments:

- Appointments, transfers, resignations, leaves of absence, changes in time of service, changes in tenure, promotion in rank, establishment of emeritus status, changes in position, and adjustments, and reductions of time and salary involving positions which are assigned academic rank, excluding deans, vice presidents, and institutional executive officers, whose such changes come within the budget authorization.

1. Temporary and nonrecurring transfers between requisition and salary accounts within a department.

2. Temporary and nonrecurring budget transfers between departments or divisions of an institution provided they are not used to create new permanent positions or other recurring expenses.
2.4. Budget additions to care for emergencies in staff, requisition accounts, or repair and maintenance items from the board's unappropriated fund or the board's emergency reserves provided no single addition may exceed (4,800) $10,000, and provided these funds are not used to create new permanent positions or other recurring expenses.

A permanent record of all of the personnel adjustments and budget transfers approved by the chancellor is to be maintained in the board's budget office. Any changes in the board's unappropriated fund or board's emergency reserves resulting from budget transfers approved by the chancellor are to be included in the finance report from the board's budget office presented to board members at each regular meeting. If policy questions or unusual appointments are involved, the chancellor will advise, consult with, and secure the approval of the board. See also AR 70.180 Plant rehabilitation.

41.010 Appointment Procedures

1. (Except as provided in AR 41.210, appointments to positions in the academic classifications in the salary budget are made by the board upon the recommendations of the department head, the dean, the executive head of the institution, and the chancellor.)

The secretary of the board and vice chancellors shall be appointed by the board of higher education upon the recommendation of the chancellor. All other appointments to the board's office shall be made by the chancellor, or with his approval.

Presidents shall be appointed by the board of higher education on the recommendation of the chancellor.

Vice presidents and executive deans (e.g., deans of faculties, deans of administration) shall be appointed by the board of higher education upon the joint recommendation of the chancellor and the president.

Deans of schools or colleges shall be appointed by the president, subject to approval by the chancellor.

All other members of the faculty (except for those cited immediately above), and other employees of the institutions and of the agencies appointed to the board's office shall be appointed by the president— or, in the case of the agencies attached to the board's office by the agency heads - subject to the approval of the chancellor; or the chancellor is authorized, at his discretion, to delegate full responsibility for such appointments to the institutional executives and agency heads.

2. Appointments to classified positions in the wage budget are subject to institutional and state civil service regulations.

3. Appointments to nonclassified academic positions are to be made in the same manner as outlined for classified positions in paragraph 1.

4. All (regular) academic employees (in the salary budget of the system) shall receive each year formal notification of conditions and terms of employment for the fiscal year beginning July 1 (see par. 5 below). Such notification (4y) shall be issued by the (president) institutional executive, or by the chancellor or agency heads of agencies attached to the board's office (e.g., DEE, Teaching Research, OPPB) in those instances in which neither the chancellor and the agency heads are the appointing officials, on a form approved by the chancellor. Unless otherwise authorized by the chancellor, appointments or reappointments are for a period not beyond the fiscal year designated in the notice of appointment.

5. The notice of appointment shall include, but not necessarily be limited to the following:

   a. Effective date of appointment.
   b. Description of position offered (including reference to any unusual duties).
   c. Academic rank and title offered.
   d. Duration of appointment.
   e. Tenure status, including the nature of any restrictions on eligibility for tenure (e.g., limited term or temporary appointments or appointments funded by grant funds beyond institutional control).
   f. Compensation offered.
   g. Other conditions of employment (e.g., AR 41.120, par. 1).

6. The faculty member shall be provided - with his initial notice of appointment, and whenever there is a significant change in the institutional expectations as to professional standards, obligations, and responsibilities to be met by faculty members, or whenever a change in job in the faculty member's status or assignment that significantly affects the institution's expectations of the faculty member - written information concerning his or her duties and responsibilities as follows:

   a. General institutional expectations as to the professional standards, obligations, and responsibilities to be met by faculty members, as set forth in the faculty handbook, or similar document, including but not necessarily limited to the following:

       (1) Criteria to be used in evaluating the faculty member in connection with (a) renewal of
make more specific the responsibilities of the institutional executives in (a) issuing notices of appointment to faculty, (b) informing new faculty as to the nature of the evaluative procedures to be used in making decisions relative to renewal of appointment, promotion, or tenure, and (c) to make explicit the desire of the board that institutions should establish written procedures to provide for direct input from faculty, department heads, and deans, and for the appropriate use of student evaluations in faculty personnel decisions.

AR 11.110, AR 11.120, and AR 41.010 in the present Administrative Rules all refer to the appointments, promotions, transfers, suspensions, and terminations of faculty and other personnel, but taken together, these sections are quite ambiguous.

In clarifying the foregoing sections, the board's office has provided that the board shall make all the appointments of only the top officials, including the secretary of the board, vice chancellors, presidents, vice presidents, and executive deans (e.g., deans of faculties, deans of administration); that these appointments shall be made on the basis of recommendations to the board from the chancellor (and from the president, in the case of appointment of vice presidents and executive deans).

Deans would thereafter be appointed, transferred, suspended, or terminated by the presidents, subject to approval by the chancellor, and subject to compliance with the appropriate administrative rules in the case of suspensions or terminations.

As to the appointment and other personnel actions relating to institutional academic personnel other than those identified above, the proposed administrative rules provide that either: (1) the appointments may be made by the president of the institution, upon the approval of the chancellor, or (2) the chancellor may, at his discretion, delegate all responsibility for these appointments and other relevant personnel actions, to the presidents, contingent, of course, upon these actions coming within the authorized budget, and contingent also upon compliance with any relevant state statutes or relevant administrative rules of the board.

41.015 Consultative Procedures

In the exercise of the authority given the institutional executive to administer the institution over which he provides, the institutional executive shall establish written procedures through which faculty, department heads, and deans shall have the opportunity for effective participation in the deliberations leading to recommendations as to appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion of faculty. The procedures established shall provide also for the consideration of information from other appropriate sources, including, but not limited to, evaluations of faculty by students.

Commentary on Items 1, 2, 3, 9.

The foregoing proposed modifications in the Administrative Rules are designed: (1) to clarify the designation of responsibility for faculty personnel decisions, (2) to
41.105 Kinds of Appointments

Appointments authorized in the several institutions of the state system are of two kinds: (1) fixed-term appointments, (2) tenure-related appointments: (a) annual tenure, (b) indefinite tenure.

1. Fixed-term appointments are appointments for a specified period of time, as set forth in the notice of appointment. The faculty member thus appointed is not on the tenure track and the timely notice provisions of AR 41.110 do not apply.

   Fixed-term appointments may be made and are renewable at the discretion of the institutional executive.

   Fixed-term appointments are designed for use at the discretion of the institutional executive in such cases as appointment of visiting faculty of similar category; academic staff members whose support wholly or principally comes from grant or contract funds, the cessation of which funding would eliminate the budget base for the position in question; and part-time faculty. Visiting appointments to any faculty member shall not exceed a total of seven years.

   Institutional staffing plans developed under AR 42.900 shall define the characteristics, the proper use, and the appropriate limits on the use of visiting faculty or similar category.

2. Annual tenure appointments are appointments given to full-time regular faculty when the institution considers to be on the tenure track, in that upon completion of an appropriate probationary period as provided in AR 41.120 they will be evaluated and considered for appointment to indefinite tenure. If the initial annual tenure appointment or successive annual tenure appointments are to be terminated otherwise than for cause or for financial exigency, timely notice as provided in AR 41.110 shall be given the faculty member.

3. Indefinite tenure appointments are appointments given selected faculty members by the institutional executive under authority contained in AR 11.110 and AR 41.110 in witness of the institution's formal decision that the faculty member is of such demonstrated professional competence that the institution will henceforth terminate his employment except for: (a) cause, (b) financial exigency, or (c) program reductions or eliminations.

"Tenured" faculty, as referred to in these Administrative Rules, are faculty who have been awarded indefinite tenure.

Commentary on Item 4

The present Administrative Rules contain no definition of tenure. The above section is intended to correct that deficiency.

Item 5. Establishment of eligibility for tenure.

41.110 (Instructors)

Full-time members of the academic staff, appointed with the rank of instructor or above shall be employed on a one-year basis and indefinite tenure shall not be granted to persons holding such rank. Prior to the end of three years of service, a review shall be made to determine whether such persons shall be considered for promotion to assistant professor or whether indefinite tenure shall be granted, effective with the fourth year of service or later.

41.110 (Persons in the Professional Ranks)

Full-time members of the academic staff appointed with the rank of assistant professor or above shall be employed on a one-year basis and ordinarily are considered for indefinite tenure effective with the fourth year of service. It is recognized that at times it may be desirable to grant indefinite tenure before the end of three years to persons appointed with the rank of associate or full professor. An annual review shall be made by the executive head of those persons eligible for promotion beyond the rank of assistant professor.

41.110 Eligibility for Indefinite Tenure

1. Indefinite tenure may be awarded to qualified regular faculty employed full time in one of the following academic ranks: assistant professor, associate professor, professor.

2. Indefinite tenure shall be awarded to faculty of demonstrated professional competence by the institutional executive under terms and conditions set forth in AR 11.110 and AR 41.120 and in applicable institutional regulations.
3. Tenure is reaffirmed as being institutional, not systemic. Faculty having achieved tenure status in one state system institution cannot thereby claim tenure in other institutions of the state system.

Probationary years of service in one institution of the state system may be counted toward probationary service requirements in another state system institution only with the latter's explicit approval and agreement (see AR 41.120, par. 5).

Commentary on Item 5.

The above proposed changes in the Administrative Rules seek to (1) clarify the categories of faculty eligible for consideration for tenure status, (2) make explicit the fact that the achievement of tenure is dependent upon demonstrated professional competence and that tenure status is bestowed by overt, specific institutional decision and action, and (3) that tenure is institutional, not systemic.

The foregoing proposed rule makes only full-time regular faculty members eligible for consideration for tenure appointments. Faculty representatives from the state federation of AAP, OSEA, and the inter-institutional faculty senate urge that regular part-time faculty members also be afforded access to tenure when they meet the qualifications appropriate to tenure. The National Commission on Academic Tenure asserts that "on balance, the commission views tenure for regular part-time faculty members as desirable." This matter is discussed in greater detail pp. 47-53.

Item 6.

Providing for adequate probationary service as the basis for attainment of tenure.

41.120 Initial Appointment and Probationary Service for Faculty on Tenure-Related Appointments.

1. All full-time regular faculty members on tenure-related appointments (41.105), except as provided below, shall be appointed initially on one-year appointments.

2. Awarding of tenure, except as modified below, shall involve the assessment of the faculty member's performance each year during his probationary period (AR 42.150, par. 1b), and the assessment of his performance over not less than five consecutive years (counting the year at the end of which tenure is granted). An additional probationary year may be required by the institutional executive, following which, if the faculty member is not awarded tenure, he shall be given formal notice, except as provided in AR 41.120.

3. Notwithstanding the above provision, the institutional executive may, in special circumstances, consider for tenure any probationary faculty member of the rank of assistant professor or higher, earlier than following the normal probationary period cited above when, following an evaluation of the performance of the faculty member, he finds that such an early award of tenure would be to the advantage of the institution, but in no event will the first consideration for tenure occur later than in the fifth year.

4. Faculty members given an initial appointment at the rank of full professor may be granted tenure upon appointment at the discretion of the institutional executive. In unusual cases, and only when specifically approved by the chancellor, associate professors may be granted tenure upon initial appointment.

5. At the time of initial appointment, a mutually acceptable written agreement shall be arrived at between the faculty member and the institutional executive or his designated representative, subject to delegation of authority made under AR 11.110, as to the extent to which any prior experience of the faculty member shall be credited as part of the probationary period to be required of the faculty member before he may be considered for tenure, and the terms of the agreement shall be included in the notice of appointment.

41.130 Consecutive Annual Appointments.

A series of annual appointments shall be considered consecutive whether or not interrupted by one or more
official leaves of absence. An official leave of absence does not count as a year of service for purposes of tenure, nor does it prejudice the staff member's rights to tenure for service actually rendered.

41.140 Seventh Annual Appointment

(Annual) Appointment of a full-time, regular, faculty member (above the rank of instructor) who is on annual tenure, for a seventh consecutive year shall be accompanied either by the award of tenure or by notice of termination effective at the end of the seventh year, except as provided in AR 41.150 (normally include the granting of tenure unless the seventh annual notice of appointment specifically provides otherwise).

41.150 Exceptions

The provisions of sections AR 41.110, 41.120, 41.130, 41.140, and of the paragraph regarding timely notice (AR 41.310) shall apply to all tenure-related appointments as defined in AR 41.105 unless in individual cases there is a definite written mutual understanding to the contrary, in which case the exception will be stated in the notice of appointment.

Commentary on Item 6.

The proposed rules provide that the normal pattern of awarding tenure shall involve the assessment of the faculty member's performance over not less than five consecutive years. The awarding of tenure would thus be effective in the sixth year, or if, in a given case, another year of probationary service should be necessary before arriving at a decision, the faculty member would, before the close of the sixth year, either be awarded tenure, to be effective in the seventh year, or given terminal notice, except as provided in AR 41.150.

Having stated what the normal pattern of awarding tenure is, the proposed rules provide for the exercise of discretion on the part of the institutional executive in awarding tenure in special cases in which, in the judgment of the institutional executive, it would be to the advantage of the institution to grant tenure earlier than provided in the normal pattern. The board's office believes that the authorization of such discretionary powers to the institutional executive is essential to the effective administration of the institution. For, despite the present multitude of candidates for faculty positions, there are occasions when the institutional executive may have need, in seeking to retain a particularly valued faculty member's services, to award him tenure earlier than provided in the normal pattern.
Item 7. Establishment of faculty evaluative criteria.

41.160 Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

1. Criteria for faculty evaluation, developed with the participation of appropriate faculty and institutional councils, shall be established in each institution:
   a. As a guide in evaluating faculty in connection with decisions as to reappointment, promotion, tenure;
   b. As a basis for renewing those aspects of the faculty member's performance in which improvement is desirable, whether the faculty member is tenured or non-tenured, with a view to stimulating and assisting the faculty member toward improvement through the resources available under the institution's staff career support plan.

2. The criteria shall reflect the primary functions for which the state system was established, namely:
   a. Instruction.
   b. Research accomplishments and other scholarly achievements, or where relevant, other creative and artistic achievement.
   c. Professional-related public service, through which the institution and its members render service to the public (i.e., individuals, agencies or units of business, industry, government).
   d. Institutional service, which includes but is not limited to the contributions made toward departmental, school, or institutional governance, service to students through student welfare activities such as individual student advising, advising with student organizations or groups, and similar activities.

3. The criteria shall provide guidelines as to the sources and kinds of data that are appropriate as a basis for the accumulation of the information and data necessary to an effective evaluation of faculty at each of the several administrative levels (e.g., department, school, institution) as which evaluations of faculty must be made in each of the areas identified immediately above (i.e., teaching, research, and scholarly activity, etc.). Specific provision shall be made for appropriate student input into the evidence accumulated as the basis for reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.
Item 8. Establishing consistency among various levels in the institutional administrative hierarchy and faculty groups involved in tenure decisions in the understanding and the application of the evaluative criteria on which tenure decisions are based.

(In the May 3 draft of these proposed administrative rules, there was included at this point a rule requiring the institutional executive to take the necessary steps to assure the desired consistency among various levels in the institutional administrative hierarchy and faculty groups involved in the tenure decisions in the understanding and application of the evaluative criteria on which tenure decisions are based.

We have in the interim concluded that although such a result is necessary, the expression of that goal is more appropriately stated in an internal management directive than in an administrative rule.)

Commentary on Item 8

The application of evaluative criteria in making tenure decisions is a complex process. It involves the marshaling of a great many facts and their interpretation in accordance with a variety of value systems by a variety of administrative officials and faculty groups, including department chairs (and, in some cases, departmental faculty committees), deans (and in some cases school-wide faculty advisory committees), the vice president for academic affairs or dean of faculties, the president's faculty advisory council, or similar faculty group, and finally the president.

If justice is to be done the faculty member being considered for tenure, and if the tenure system is to operate effectively, those who are involved in making the evaluations at the various levels (departmental, school, institutional) must come to a reasonably consistent understanding of the criteria to be employed at each of the several levels, and of the way they are to be applied. Administrative and faculty groups involved in making the evaluations must be skilled in applying the criteria applicable at their level of review, and skilled as well in conveying to the faculty member being evaluated, the nature of the criteria and the method of their application at the various levels of evaluation.

This requires a sufficient interaction among the various evaluating officials and faculty groups at the several levels (e.g., department, school, institution) to permit the development of common, that is to say, similar understandings. Such understandings can be achieved only when the institution provides for planned, organized opportunities for sharing views among the evaluating administrative officials and faculty groups. Perhaps the application of the evaluative criteria to a variety of factual situations, involving administrative officials and faculty groups from each of the levels of review (i.e., department, school, institution), would serve as one useful instrument through which to approach the development of these common understandings. The administrators and faculty, in their ingenuity, will identify others.

But, it must be understood that the foregoing activities, designed though they be to achieve a greater uniformity of understanding among administrative officials and faculty groups involved in initiating and reviewing tenure nominations, will not — cannot — assure, nor should they, that all, or perhaps a majority, of the tenure nominations initiated at the departmental level will survive the review at the school level, or that all of the nominations forwarded by a given school within an institution will be approved by the president's office. There are considerations operating at the school and institutional level that may be expected for obvious reasons to winnow carefully the tenure nominations forwarded from the departments and schools, respectively.
Item 10.11. Defining the bases upon which a faculty member's employment may be terminated and establishing termination procedures insuring an effective judicial process which assures the faculty member academic due process.

41.305 Resignations

Notice of resignation shall be filed in the executive office of the institution as early as possible, but in no event (nor) later than one month before the resignation is to take effect. When a resignation occurs, the executive office shall notify the business office as soon as possible in order that proper accounting may be made as to inventory of property in the custody of the employee, delivery of keys, and other arrangements for termination of employment.

41.310 Timely Notice

If any appointment of (is) a full-time regular academic staff member (who is on an annual tenure appointment as defined in AR 41.303, (or an indefinite tenure) is to be terminated otherwise than for cause or financial exigency, he shall be given timely notice of termination in writing as follows: during the first year of appointment, at least three months' notice prior to the expiration of the appointment; during the second year of service, at least six months before the expiration of the appointment; thereafter, at least twelve months' notice before the expiration of the appointment.

41.315 Terminations

Terminations can be either for cause or not for cause, as defined below. Rules regarding separations and/or sanctions (see AR 41.325) apply to all members of the academic staff, both those having indefinite tenure and those not on indefinite tenure.

41.320 Termination Not for Cause

Termination not for cause is defined as any termination other than for cause as set forth in AR 41.325.

1. Staff Members with Indefinite Tenure

The appointment of an academic staff member with indefinite tenure will not be terminated for reasons other than for cause, except for financial exigency, or (b) program reductions or eliminations. Before the appointment of any academic staff member on indefinite tenure can be terminated for financial exigency, a bona fide determination will be made by the institutional executive that such financial exigency in fact does exist, and that (as) sufficient funds are in fact not available for the payment of compensation for the position concerned. Program reductions or eliminations may be made by the institutional executive upon his determination, pursuant to institutional procedures providing for faculty and other appropriate input, that such reductions or eliminations are consistent with the goals and the needs of the institution.

Responsibility for the decision as to the existence of a state of financial exigency, and the subsequent decision as to the actions necessary to meet the financial exigency, or the decision as to the necessity for program reductions or eliminations that result in termination of employment of tenure faculty shall rest with the institutional executive. In considering such matters, the institutional executive shall confer in a timely way with appropriate faculty and other institutional council and with the chancellor and the board concerning the issues involved in arriving at decisions in the foregoing areas.

Institutional procedures relating to discontinuance of a program or department or reductions therein shall reflect a report (or the rights of the affected academic staff member, and such procedures may not be used as a substitute for the provisions of AR 41.330-41.390, which set forth the procedural protections to be accorded academic members.

If a tenured faculty member's appointment is terminated or if the appointment of a tenured faculty member is terminated before the end of the period of appointment because of financial exigency, or because of the discontinuance of a program or department, the released faculty member's place will not be filled by a replacement within a period of two years, unless the released faculty member has been offered reappointment and a reasonable time within which to accept or decline it.

If the staff member cannot be retained either in the position in which presently employed or in some alternate position, maximum possible notice of termination shall be provided the academic
staff member being terminated for financial exigency. This is not applicable to any time when a staff member's employment is terminated for other reasons, including but not limited to, incompetence, gross inefficiency, violation of academic integrity in teaching, research, or scholarship, (and) intentional or habitual neglect of duty, and failure to perform adequately for medical reasons.

41.335 Initiation of Formal Proceedings

If the institutional executive, after exploring to his satisfaction the possibilities of a mutual settlement, determines that there is probable cause to impose a sanction or sanctions more severe than oral or written warning or reprimand upon an academic staff member, he shall authorize the preparation of formal charges in accordance with institutional procedure. The charges shall specifically state the facts believed to constitute the grounds for the imposition of a sanction or sanctions. Following the authorization of preparation of the charges, the institutional officer responsible for evaluating the charges shall participate in their preparation. Within 10 days after the authorization of preparation of the charges, the institution shall be notified of the institutional executive, and a copy personally delivered, or sent by certified mail, to the academic staff member.

41.340 Temporary Suspension of Academic Staff Member

If at any time during the pendency of the charges against the academic staff member the institutional executive makes a finding that there is a clear and present danger that the academic staff member's continued performance of his duties will be harmful to the institution, to the academic staff member, or to the public at large, the institutional executive may suspend the academic staff member, without financial penalty, from some or all of his duties.

41.345 Academic Staff Member's Request for a Formal Hearing

Within 10 days after the personal delivery or mailing of a copy of the charges to the academic staff member, the academic staff member who is so charged shall state in writing to the institutional executive whether he desires a formal hearing on the charges. This 10-day period may be reasonably extended by the institutional executive. If the academic staff member requests a writing that he not have a formal hearing, the institutional executive may impose an appropriate sanction or sanctions upon the academic staff member to be effective as determined by the institutional executive, who shall promptly give written notice thereof to the academic staff member; provided, however, that the appointment of an academic staff member shall not be terminated except as provided in AR 41.376.
41.350 Hearing Committee

Unless the academic staff member requests in writing that he not have a formal hearing on the charges, such hearing shall be before a special ad hoc committee of from three to five members. Committee members shall be selected in the following manner: the advisory council, faculty senate, or other proper elective faculty body shall appoint one or more permanent panels each consisting of ten faculty members; from one, or if necessary, two, of the permanent panels, the same elective body will name from three to five to serve as the hearing committee. The academic staff member and the administration are each allowed one peremptory challenge; a committee member so challenged will then be replaced from the same panel or panels of ten each by the elective body initially charged with impanneling. The committee shall be constituted promptly and shall complete the hearing and its report within 30 days of its constitution, if possible. The hearing committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

41.355 Conduct of Hearing

The committee shall set a date for the hearing, giving sufficient time to the academic staff member to prepare his case. The academic staff member and the administration shall have the option of assistance by counsel, both in preparing for and at the hearing. Not less than one week before the hearing date, the academic staff member shall file with the committee any such written statement of his case as he elects to file. The committee shall review the charges and the academic staff member's statement, if any, prior to the hearing. During the period between the filing of the charges and the institutional executive's action on the committee's report, the academic staff member shall enjoy the same academic freedom as other members of the faculty, unless suspended as provided in 41.340 of these Administrative Rules.

If the academic staff member has neither requested in writing that he have a formal hearing nor requested in writing that he not have a formal hearing, the committee shall consider the case on the basis of the obtainable information and decide what, if any, sanction or sanctions it will recommend be imposed upon the academic staff member. The academic staff member shall have the option of a public or private hearing except that the committee, for cause, may require that the hearing be limited to a few observers, including representatives of the press. The conduct of the hearing shall be under the control of the committee chairman, subject to the procedure of the committee.

A verbatim record of the hearing shall be kept. At the hearing, the testimony of witnesses, upon oath or affirmation, and other evidence concerning any disputed facts shall be received by the committee. The administration shall have the burden of proving its formal charges against the academic staff member and the committee findings shall be according to the preponderance of the evidence.

The committee shall not be strictly bound to follow court procedures or rules of evidence, except as otherwise required by law. The academic staff member shall have the right to appear, and to participate in the hearing and to present relevant evidence to the committee and he may be represented by counsel with or without the presence of the academic staff member. The academic staff member and the administration shall have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. The administration will, so far as possible, secure the cooperation, for attendance at the hearing, of witnesses requested by the academic staff member. The academic staff member and the administration shall be given a reasonable opportunity to submit rebuttal testimony or other evidence. At the conclusion of the testimony, the committee may permit each side to make an oral or written summation; if this privilege is extended to one side, it must be extended to both. When the committee is satisfied that all pertinent and available evidence has been received, and that such statements as it deems appropriate have been presented, the hearing will be adjourned. The committee will then go into executive session for the purpose of deliberation.

41.360 Committee's Report

The committee, by agreement of at least a majority of the members thereof, shall make explicit findings based upon the hearing record with respect to each specification in the formal charges lodged against the academic staff member, and shall within 10 days following determination by the committee of its findings recommend, by agreement of at least a majority of the members thereof, what, if any,
sanction or sanctions be imposed upon the academic staff member. The institutional executive and the academic staff member shall be given copies of the findings and recommendation. The verbatim record of the hearing shall be made available to the institutional executive and to the academic staff member for copying, or copies thereof shall be made for them at cost upon their request.

41.365 Action by the Institutional Executive

The institutional executive may, if he deems it necessary, refer the matter back to the committee for further findings of fact. The institutional executive shall, promptly after receipt of the committee's report and after having had a reasonable opportunity to consult with the chancellor and others, give the academic staff member and the chancellor written notice of his decision and of his reasons therefor if his decision is to impose a sanction or sanctions upon an academic staff member, when it is to be effective; provided, however, that the appointment of an academic staff member shall not be terminated except as provided in AR 41.370.

41.370 Date of Termination

If the appointment of an academic staff member is to be terminated according to the procedure in AR 41.365, the appointment shall not be terminated sooner than one month nor later than one year from the end of the 10-day period (or as it may have been extended), provided, however, that an academic staff member having indefinite tenure whose appointment is terminated for cause other than misconduct shall receive his salary for one year from the end of the 10-day period, or as it may have been extended.

If the appointment of an academic staff member is to be terminated according to the procedure in AR 41.365, the appointment shall not be terminated sooner than one month nor later than one year from the date of the written notice, and provided that an academic staff member having indefinite tenure whose appointment is terminated for cause other than misconduct shall receive his salary for one year from the date of the written notice.

41.375 Review by the Board

The board shall review any case of the imposition of a sanction or sanctions upon an academic staff member having indefinite tenure upon written notice of appeal by the academic staff member. This appeal shall be filled with the board's secretary within ten days (or within such extension of time as permitted for cause by the chancellor) of the date of the written notice of the institutional executive's decision, stating grounds for the appeal, with a copy to the institutional executive. The board may on its own initiative review any case involving the question of the imposition of a sanction or sanctions upon an academic staff member. Upon receiving a notice of any written notice of appeal by an academic staff member having indefinite tenure or of the board's decision to review a case, the institutional executive shall forward to the board's secretary the following: a copy of the charges in the case and of the academic staff member's written statement, if any, in answer thereto; the verbatim record of the hearing, and any exhibits; the committee's findings and recommendations; and a copy of the notice of the institutional executive's decision.

The board may: review the case on the record only; return the case to the institution from which it came for the receipt of further evidence or testimony; conduct such hearings as it deems proper for its review; refer the matter to a committee of board members for consideration, including possible hearings, and recommendations; or refer the matter to a hearing officer for hearings and recommendation. The board shall make such determination of the case, pursuant to this code, as it deems just.

If the board sustains the decision to impose a sanction or sanctions upon the academic staff member, the sanction or sanctions shall be effective at the date originally named by the institutional executive, or such later date as determined by the board.

41.380 Board's Initiative in Bringing Investigation or Charges

On any occasion when it appears to the board that there is probable cause to impose a sanction or sanctions upon an academic staff member, the board may direct the institutional executive to determine whether he finds there is probable cause to impose a sanction or sanctions upon the academic staff member. If the finding of the institutional executive is that there is probable cause to impose a sanction or sanctions upon the academic staff member, the institutional
An alternative proposal was suggested at the open hearings on tenure held by the academic affairs committee in November 1970, namely that the faculty hearing committee provided for in AR 41.350 be replaced by a hearing officer. The rationale for a hearing officer was presented by the proponent of the proposal as being greater efficiency and the conservation of faculty resources. Faculty committee members are often unacquainted with the legal and procedural niceties that ought to be observed in cases involving potentially serious sanctions. It was suggested that an experienced hearing officer, it was suggested, with appropriate experience and background in handling such cases, and with an academic background as well, might afford the hearing the best of both worlds, it was said. A collateral advantage, it was suggested, is that faculty time wouldn't be taken up in such hearings which, if the committee is inexperienced, may be more prolonged than had a hearing officer been handling the case. The board's office has opted, in its recommendation, to provide for flexibility in committee size, permitting institutional executives to appoint committees of three to five members, rather than the substitution of a hearing officer for a faculty hearing committee.

Two other suggestions for change in the rules relating to resignations and terminations were received by the board's office, but not acted upon affirmatively. These related to (1) the definition of "cause," and (2) the option opened to the board when a case involving the imposition of a sanction or sanctions on a tenured faculty member is appealed to the board in writing. Let us elaborate.

- Definition of cause: Question concerning the definition of "cause" (AR 41.350) was raised by representatives of various faculty groups at the time the board adopted the present Administrative Rules on resignations and terminations (November 1970) and these same questions continue to be raised by faculty representatives.

The issue briefly is this: The faculty representatives felt that a clear distinction should be made between the general standards of cause of application of sanctions, and specific kinds of conduct which may be evidence to demonstrate cause but ought not, ipso facto, to be considered cause themselves.

Faculty representatives feel that cause can best be defined as "failure to perform the responsibilities of an academic staff member, arising out of his particular assignment, toward his students, toward his academic discipline, toward his colleagues, or toward the institution in its primary educational and scholarly functions and secondary administrative functions of maintaining property, disbursing funds, keeping records, providing living accommodations and other services, sponsoring activities, and protecting the health and safety of persons in the institutional community."
Evidence to demonstrate cause they feel can best be defined as "evidence of incompetence, gross inefficiency, default of academic integrity in teaching, research, or scholarship, intentional or habitual neglect of duty, conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude during the period of employment by the Department of Higher Education (or prior thereto if the conviction was willfully concealed in applying to the department for employment) and violation of the Administrative Rules, or any specific regulations promulgated by the board of Higher Education, or under delegated authority, by an institution."

This separation of cause from evidence of cause would leave in the hands of the faculty hearing committee the decision as to whether or not: (1) the faculty member was guilty of conduct falling under any of the foregoing items listed under "evidence of cause" and, if so, (2) whether that conduct had in fact resulted in his failure to meet his obligations as an academic staff member, arising out of his particular assignment. This latter point is a critical one with faculty groups. For the crucial test is determining whether the faculty member is to have sanctions applied against him ought to be, the faculty groups hold, whether or not his conduct has, in fact, caused him to fail in his obligations as an academic staff member, not whether or not he is guilty of some specific act or acts which have not been demonstrated to have impaired the performance of his duties.

The fault with the present definition of "cause," as the faculty groups see it, is that "cause" is now defined in such a manner that specific acts become cause for sanctions (i.e., (1) conviction of a felony or a crime involving moral turpitude . . . and (2) conduct prescribed by section 42.410 of the Administrative Rules), whether or not the specific act committed by the faculty member can be shown to have contributed to failure on his part to perform the responsibilities of an academic staff member, arising out of his particular assignment . . .

The faculty groups' objections to this definition of "cause" is that they fear that it could lead to injustices, that it may place the board under pressures for action against faculty members in instances in which the conduct of which the faculty member is charged would not be thought by an objective committee of his peers to have had an adverse impact on his fitness in the academic community or on his performance in the academic sphere.

In response to this faculty concern, it can be said, as we said in 1970, that any cases involving alleged faculty conduct set forth in the actions defined in the statement on "cause" (AR 41.330) will, under the Administrative Rules, be heard by a committee of the faculty member's peers which can exercise discretion in their judgments. But this carries little comfort for faculty groups, for they point out that the board has made explicit in the Administrative Rules the right of the board to review any disciplinary case and to initiate disciplinary proceedings against faculty members. Under these circumstances, faculty groups hold, the faculty member is always subject to the application of the severest penalty (termination) on the basis of board action when he is found to be guilty of either a felony or crime involving moral turpitude, or of conduct prescribed in AR 42.410, without any consideration as to whether his conduct has resulted in failure to perform his obligations as an academic staff member.

What the faculty groups would have preferred, and continue to prefer, is that in AR 41.330 (Definition of Cause) the first two parts of the three-part definition of cause, namely (1) the conviction of a felony involving moral turpitude . . . and (2) conduct prescribed by section 42.410 of these Rules, be changed from "cause" to "evidence to demonstrate cause" which would then permit the faculty hearing committee to exercise judgment in interpreting the acts of which the faculty member has been found guilty, in deciding whether the commission of the acts as charged was sufficient evidence to warrant the application of the sanctions provided for in AR 41.325.

The board, having been fully informed as to the foregoing concern of the faculty groups concluded in 1970 that it preferred the definition of "cause" as it is set forth in AR 41.330.

Options open to the board when a case involving imposition of a sanction or sanctions on a tenured faculty is appealed to the board in writing:

AR 41.375 provides that the board shall review any case of the imposition of a sanction or sanctions upon an academic staff member having indefinite tenure, upon written notice of appeal by the academic staff member.

AR 41.375 provides that if reviewing the case the board has the option of (1) reviewing the case on the record.
only, (2) returning the case to the institution from which it came for the receipt of further evidence or testimony; (3) conducting such hearings as it deems proper for its review; (4) referring the matter to a committee of board members for consideration, including possible hearings and recommendations; or (5) referring the matter to a hearing officer for hearings and recommendations.

Suggestion was made in one of the discussions of tenure that consideration be given to modifying AR 41.375 to read that the board may review any such case on written appeal, and that one of the options open to the board upon receipt of such an appeal ought to be to deny the petition without a review of the record.

The board's office does not propose such changes in the rules. In so serious a matter as possible termination of employment, the tenured faculty member should have the opportunity for board review of his case should he request it in writing.

Item 12. Providing for a periodic, systematic evaluation of tenured faculty members.

41.170 Post-Tenure Review

1. Tenured faculty members shall be evaluated periodically and systematically in accordance with plans developed by the institutions. The plans shall be subject to review by the chancellor and the board.

2. Institutional plans for post-tenure reviews shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:

a. A statement of the objectives of post-tenure review and evaluation of faculty.

b. A statement as to the criteria to be used in the evaluation; the nature and kinds of information and data that will be accumulated and by what means, as a basis for the evaluation.

c. A designation of those who are to make the evaluations, and with what frequency and regularity.

d. A description of the institutional plan for (1) tying the post-tenure review into the faculty reward system so as to provide appropriate recognition for excellence, and (2) punitive timely but humane and situations in which a faculty member's lessened vitality and drive, or diminishing competence, are such that the resources of the faculty career support program are necessary to provide the stimulation or help necessary to return the individual to a fully effective state.

Commentary on Item 12: The recommendation that the foregoing rule be adopted by the board is not to be taken as evidence that the board's office believes that there is presently no institutional evaluation of tenured faculty. Tenured faculty are evaluated periodically now, though not as systematically or perhaps as regularly as they would be under the proposed rule. Evaluation presently occurs in connection with promotion decisions, as a basis for making staff assignments and allocating salary increases, sabbaticals, and other leave, stenographic and clerical help, and in the universities, in particular, in the allocation of research support.

Indeed some thoughtful administrators in the state system feel that the present post-tenure evaluations - affecting as they do the distribution of scarce resources - are already being made by the institutions at such times and under such conditions as to give the evaluations maximum impact and effectiveness;
that to establish a policy that would require more formal pre-tenure reviews than are now generally being made by our institutions and to require that they be made at specific intervals in the post-tenure career of faculty, would place an unnecessary work load on administrators and faculty already heavily burdened; that any benefits from such formal evaluations would be inconsequential with the investment in staff time and effort required.

Why, then, does the board's office recommend the adoption of the foregoing rule? Largely for two reasons, the first having to do with the public image of higher education and the impact of that image on the level of public support, and the second having to do with the anticipated direct benefits to the institutions. But let us elaborate:

- There is a widespread view among laymen that the life of a tenured faculty member is something of a sinecure, protected as they believe him to be against the rigors of the competitive world of the broader community, and deprived as he appears to them of even the stimulus to good works which the pre-tenure institutional evaluations gave him in his formative professional years.

Unreal and inaccurate as such an image may appear, it cannot be assuaged merely by declaring it to be an errant aberration of the uninformed. Not when this same image is projected by some able writers from within the profession, and not when national reports and studies drafted by people from within the profession call for a re-examination of tenure and its administration.

In the face of these allegations and this public image, the board's office is persuaded that nothing less than the assurance that there is operative in each institution in the state system a program of systematic post-tenure review will satisfactorily respond to the rising tide of criticisms of tenure. Nothing less will protect tenure and the institutions against the criticisms and allegations which - however baseless and unwarranted they may seem - are damaging to higher education in the public mind, namely, the allegation that tenure serves to insulate the tenured professor against the necessity of continuing to "measure up," that tenure protects inefficiency, incompetence, idleness.

But more than the need to be concerned with the public image of tenure is involved in the board's office recommendation concerning post-tenure review of faculty.

We believe that an organized, systematic review and evaluation of tenured faculty periodically will serve a number of significant purposes: (1) It will serve as a means of accumulating in an orderly way the evidence to demonstrate the continuing commitment of the vast majority of tenured faculty to high standards of professional conduct and performance. (2) For many professors, whose devoted labors in the vineyard may too often go unremarked, it will serve as a satisfying stimulus - (the Hawthorne effect is as real in education as in industry). (3) For some, it will provide the help of colleagues in identifying the areas in which improvement would be desirable, and would provide stimulus and help in planning a program of professional development and improvement. (4) Finally, it will provide the means for the orderly accumulation of the evidence necessary to demonstrate "cause" in those few instances in which termination - through persuasion or through due process proceedings - may be the only satisfactory solution.

The board's office believes that the responsibility for the development of plans for the periodic, systematic evaluation of tenured faculty must rest with the individual institutions, in the first instance, but with provision for institutional plans to be reviewed by the chancellor.

As we have earlier noted, tenured faculty are already being evaluated to some degree in the state system institutions. We expect that the institutions will, and intend that they shall incorporate in their plans for post-tenure evaluation of faculty as provided for in AR 41.170, the elements of their present evaluation programs.
Item 13. Establishment of a staff career support program.

42.800 Staff Career Support Program

1. A staff career support plan shall be developed and maintained by each institution through institutional procedures which provide for input from appropriate faculty and institutional committees, the plans to be subject to review by the chancellor and the board.

2. The institutional plans shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:
   a. A statement of the objectives of the plan.
   b. A statement as to the extent of the institutional commitment to supportive programs for staff development.
   c. A specific delegation of authority, responsibility, and duties to the following key administrators and faculty groups for the implementation of the staff career support plan: vice presidents for academic affairs or deans of faculties, deans of schools or colleges, chairs of academic departments, faculty advisory committees or councils, individual faculty members.
   d. A delineation of the specific elements of the planned staff career support program for:
      (1) Beginning faculty members.
      (2) Faculty members in mid-career.
      (3) Faculty members in late-career.
   e. A statement as to the nature of the planned periodic institutional evaluation of the proposed plan as the program upon which it is based moves along.
   f. A statement as to the way in which the institution's faculty reward system is keyed to the staff career support plan.

Commentary on Item 13: The above proposed rule may be the most important of those presented in this document. For it speaks to the institutional obligation to provide a systematic, orderly plan through which individual faculty members, at whatever point they find themselves in the professional life cycle—beginning years, middle years, later years—may find the stimulation and the assistance that they require to remain professionally alert, active, and growing, and thus, fully productive.

A mistake commonly made in examining tenure is to dwell too much upon the judgmental aspect of the tenure principle: to give evaluation of faculty as the most significant, if not the only aspect of tenure.

Evaluation is an indispensable aspect of tenure. But it is not everything. There is a developmental aspect, too. And it is to this latter aspect that the staff career support plan speaks.

There are some who feel that the developmental aspect of tenure has been far too little noted or remembered by the institutions or by critics of the tenure principle. It is to this aspect, therefore, that a full measure of attention should be given as we work to improve tenure's administration in the state system.

The importance of this aspect of the tenure principle warrants a brief review here of some of the conditions that are necessary to the full flowering of staff career support programs in the state system institutions.

There must be an institutional plan of staff career support.

All of our institutions have some important elements of a sound program of staff career support. What is needed is to bring those elements together—with others—to create an integrated whole.

Recognizing that college and university professors differ in their abilities, interests, needs, and readiness to change, the institutional plan must have numerous different aspects to it, in order that the diverse interests be found in a heterogeneous faculty may find some aspect of the plan that will serve each of them at the level at which the faculty member is prepared to accept help and to act.

There must be institutional commitment to the plan, a commitment made apparent in the allocation of the institution's scarce resources in support of the plan, and in the clear signal given through the administrative assignments made from the president's office to the key administrators and faculty groups as to
their role and function in insuring the success of the plan.

It may be that the faculty career support plan as it is initially devised by the institution may be less adequate than the faculty or administration would wish. But the identification of the aspects in which the plan appears to faculty and administration to fall short of the mark, and the reasons therefore, may be among the most significant first steps in dramatizing faculty career support needs in the institution.

Providing a sound staffing plan for insuring a continuing inflow of new faculty and a balanced distribution of faculty in terms of age and experience in each of the institutions.

42.900 Institutional Faculty Staffing Plan

1. Each institution shall develop and maintain through appropriate faculty and administrative input, a faculty staffing plan which will assure a continuing inflow of new faculty, and which shall have as an additional pool the achievement of a balanced distribution of faculty in the institution in terms of age and experience.

2. Institutional staffing plans shall be subject to review by the chancellor and the board.

Commentary on Item 14.
The foregoing rule rests upon the assumption that there is merit in our institutions' having a continuing inflow of new faculty as a means of providing the stimulus of new or different ideas, concepts, challenges that new faculty personalities have the potentiality for injecting into the academic life-stream.

There is a continuing pool of able young graduates and recent graduates of the country's Ph.D. programs from which it is important our institutions draw regularly and consistently from year to year, that the institutions may have the benefits of the new insights that energetic young faculty can bring into an institution. These new accretions, added to an experienced faculty, provide a balance that in higher education may be nearly as important as it is in professional sports.

There is an urgency about the development of staffing plans and policies to serve these ends that was not apparent in the 1960's. During the 1960's, staff additions were continuous. Enrollments were climbing, federal funding of higher education was at an all-time high, faculty turnover was at a relatively higher level than that of what was in a rapidly expanding employment market for college professors. All this has changed, in the face of these changed conditions, plans must be made for building in a planned flexibility in employment policies that was insured in the 1960's by the natural conditions cited above.

It is apparent that with stabilizing - sometimes declining - enrollments, with a low level of faculty turnover, and the continued unadjusted workings of the tenure policies, the institutions could, in relatively short time, find themselves with all-tenured faculties. Such a development would have serious consequences to the institutions if the assumption upon which the foregoing rule is based is false.
The institutional staffing plans called for will necessarily be unique to the institution by which it is designed. But they will have common elements. Each will set forth (1) the objectives of the staffing plan in terms of the staff configuration (age, academic rank, tenure status) toward which the institution is aiming, (2) the present configuration of faculty in terms of age, academic rank, tenure status, (3) the anticipated steps by which the institution proposes to move from its present staff configuration to the desired configuration, setting forth (a) the anticipated departure rate for faculty (leave, resignations, nonreappointments, retirements, deaths), and (b) the anticipated rate of faculty additions in the several faculty ranks, and the rate at which it is anticipated tenure will be granted to the untenured.

The aspect of the staffing configuration with which we are here most concerned is that of tenure status, although it is self-evident that the age and faculty rank distributions are important concomittants and have a significant bearing on tenure status considerations.

The avoidance of "tenuring-in" of faculties is a concern widely discussed at all levels in the academic community and out. The National Commission on Academic Tenure, in its report published in March 1973, asserted that in the commission's "nearly unanimous judgment, it will probably be dangerous for most institutions if tenured faculty constitute more than one-half to two-thirds of the total full-time faculty during the decade ahead."

At the same time, the commission counsels that "special attention should be given to allow for significant expansion of the proportion of women and members of minority groups in all faculties, especially in the tenured ranks," and that in achieving the institutional policy goals as to the proportion of faculty on tenure, "institutions will need to proceed gradually in order to avoid injustices to probationary faculty whose expectations of permanent appointment may have been based on earlier, more liberal practices."

In an earlier draft of this present document, a two-thirds limitation was proposed as the basis for preliminary discussion. The draft further provided, however, that where institutions found it necessary to exceed the two-thirds limitation over the short run (three biennia) in order to meet what the institutions consider commitments to untenured faculty currently in their probationary years, they should be permitted to do so, contingent upon the development of a staffing plan designed to bring them within the guidelines within three biennia (by 1976-78).
Among the provisions not included in the present draft of the proposed Administrative Rules governing tenure are two items that the board's committee has not to the present discussed: (1) tenure for regular part-time faculty, and (2) the issue as to whether the Administrative Rules should provide that institutions should be required to give to noncontingent faculty member in writing the reasons for nonreappointment. We present these matters below as the basis for committee discussion.

Regular Part-Time Faculty
Employment Conditions

The Administrative Rules make no provision for "regular part-time" faculty members to be considered for tenure, nor in the event of termination to be given timely notice.

Requests have been received from several quarters asking that the board review current policy vis-à-vis this category of employees.

"Regular part-time" faculty members are defined as those who are employed regularly, consistently, year after year, at .5 FTE or more but less than full time. Their employment on a part-time basis may result from any one of a number of considerations of which the following are illustrative:

1. The institution may find it necessary to employ someone (e.g., a scholar or practicing professional) with substantial strength in areas of knowledge and practice which would not justify a full-time position, but whose particular kind of expertise is vital to the strength of the specialties within the program(s) offered by a department.
2. The faculty member may be of his own volition and choice conclude that he or she wishes to give or can give only part-time to the teaching assignment because of other priorities (e.g., the scholar because of commitments elsewhere; the practicing professional because of his desire to maintain an active practice; frequently, in the case of women, a commitment to child-rearing, care of the home, or some other interest).

Two other groups of part-time instructors commonly employed by institutions of the state system, but excluded from consideration in this present discussion are the following:

1. Graduate students employed by institutions having graduate programs of some magnitude, who are employed under the title of "Fellow." These appointments are the avenue through which the institution (a) provides graduate students with experience (or added experience) in college-level teaching, under the supervision of the institution - a significant aspect of graduate preparation for those looking toward a career in college teaching, (b) expands its instructional capacity.

The rank held by these part-time persons is normally not a faculty rank.

2. The instructors employed by institutions of the state system on a part-time basis to "fill in" when enrollments exceed what was anticipated and planned for or when some other staffing emergency calls for their employment, and when help must be found to meet a temporary situation.

Although such "fill in" may, and generally do, carry faculty rank, their employment tends to be episodic, and they would not normally be considered "regular part-time" faculty. It is they who provide the flexibility which permits the institutions to expand and contract the teaching force as required by the exigencies of enrollment variations and certain other kinds of emergency conditions.

The employment of "regular part-time" faculty is not uncommon in the state system. The practice, when judiciously employed, offers the institution and its departments a flexibility not otherwise obtainable. However, if used to an excess by a department, employment of part-time faculty members on a regular basis may, and almost certainly will, weaken the department's academic strength.

Some few colleges, principally in the East, are making provision on a limited basis to extend to regular part-time faculty some of the benefits that accrue to full-time faculty members, such as timely notice in the event of termination, tenure after qualifying thereby during an appropriate probationary period, and the like. This is occurring, apparently, more in institutions with a stable faculty and student body. Obviously, their problems are different than, say, a large urban university with a large part-time student body and a great many part-time faculty who are "moonlighting."

Columbia University's Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs has developed a draft code on academic freedom and tenure which would, if adopted, permit faculty on a part-time appointment to become eligible for promotion and to hold tenure in a part-time position provided that the individual gives evidence of commitment to a university career by not earning any other income from salary, and provided also that the individual does not "earn more than one fifth of his or her University salary from self-employment not directly related to his or her academic work."

At the University of Wisconsin, the Faculty Senate approved in September 1972 a recommendation from a faculty committee to the effect that:

Part-time service at less than one-half time shall not be counted in the probationary period of the assistant professor. Each year of service at the rate of at least one-half time but no more than three-quarters time shall count as half of a year for probationary purposes, and service at a rate greater than three-quarters time shall be counted as a full year. In no case shall the probationary period exceed twelve calendar years. This maximum may be decreased by
service under appropriate conditions to be credited towards the
faculty members who, for family or other appropriate reasons
eligibility for tenure to those appointed to full-time service
the fulfillment of the institution's probationary requirement.
In recent years this traditional practice has been called
positions (or of probationary service prior to tenure) to
as a serious obstacle to the pursuit of academic careers by

reasons for being accorded these privileges as do full-time faculty.
That regular part-time faculty "do not feel free to make suggestions,
and the result is, it is said, that "the motivation of the faculty"
"is low.
That regular part-time faculty members build up a period of time
in comparable terms as those in the professional groups. In such
manner, the number of years of service rendered by some faculty
whose efforts may not eventually result in increased or renewed
holding a full-timely faculty member notwithstanding.

Heality, these can be literally encompassed under the regular full-time
faculty, even when the experience is at variance here.
The National Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education sums up its
their tenure arrangements in order to permit part-time faculty

part-time faculty members as desirable. It can enhance institu-
to ease into retirement or to complete important research
institutional expansion or reduction in given disciplines,
during the probationary period by allowing faculty members
to undertake a less arduous workload during the critical years of child rearing or for other personal reasons. Finally, part-time appointments with tenure can assure the institution of an experienced and professionally committed part-time faculty while assuring job continuity to the part-time faculty member. Nevertheless, criteria for the award of tenure and promotion should be uniform for all appointees in a given discipline, including those with reduced assignments; reduced workloads, however, should be considered on a proportional basis perhaps over a longer period of time.

A recent report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Governance of Higher Education (April, 1972), also recommends that part-time faculty be covered by tenure provisions. Their statement is as follows:

- Persons on a part-time basis have a particularly difficult time accumulating a record that merits tenure over the same elapsed period (essentially six years) as for full-time persons. Consequently it would seem reasonable that, where such persons are on a 50-percent time basis or more, they should be eligible for tenure, but that the amount of time to earn tenure should be calculated on a full-time-equivalent basis and not on a calendar year basis.

Recommendation 25: Persons on a 50-percent time basis or more should be eligible for tenure, but the time elapsed before a decision on tenure must be added should be counted on a full-time-equivalent basis.

Options for Committee Consideration

of the variety of possible alternatives for consideration by the committee on academic affairs in dealing with the part-time faculty issue as it relates to tenure, we list here only two:

1. Offer access to tenure appointments only to full-time regular faculty members. This present draft of the administrative rules relating to tenure accomplishes this aim. No provision is made in the preceding sections of this report for anything other than fixed-term appointments for part-time faculty, pending committee review of the matter.

2. Modify the provisions of this present draft so as to permit consideration for part-time tenure appointments of (a) all "regular part-time" faculty, irrespective of the size of the fractional FTE appointment, or (b) those "regular part-time" faculty members whose appointment exceeds a specified minimum FTE (.50 FTE and above, for instance).

Generally speaking, those in the state system who have most pushed for inclusion of part-time faculty members under the state system's tenure provisions have been friendly to option (b) above, with .50 FTE being the lower limit of appointments to be considered for tenure.

As we have earlier noted, the National Commission on Academic Freedom and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education have both recently issued reports supporting the extension of tenure privileges to part-time faculty. OSEA, the state federation of AAUP, and the state system institutional faculty senate also urge this step, as do some state system institutional executives. Others among the institutional executives do not favor this action, at least not at this time, but would prefer that the board authorize its institutions to put regular part-time faculty on extended term contracts of something like five years' duration with authority to renew the contracts.

The modification of the language of this present draft of the tenure provisions of the Administrative Rules to include the part-time faculty could be accomplished readily should the committee wish it.

The number of regular part-time faculty in the six multipurpose institutions of the state system and OTE whose appointments are at .50 FTE or more but less than 1.0 FTE is not large when compared with the total academic staff employed in the state system. A poll of these seven institutions reveals that in 1972-73 there were approximately 50 part-time faculty without tenure, the largest number being at OTE, 60, and FSU, in that order. OCB reports but 5, and SOC, HCC, and OTE reported none.

If part-time faculty appointed at .50 FTE or more were to be included under the tenure provisions, it is presumed that (a) in all respects other than the length of the probationary period, standards of performance and scholarly quality should be the same for the part-time as for the full-time faculty being considered for tenure appointment, and (b) the tenure appointment would be limited to the fractional FTE to which the faculty member was assigned at the point at which he or she acquired tenure.

A move on the part of the state board of higher education to make regular part-time faculty members with appointments of .50 FTE or more eligible for tenure would put the state system institutions in the vanguard in recognizing part-time faculty members. There is strong support among faculty organizations in the state system, notably OSEA and AAUP, for such a move. Among institutional executives there is a division of opinion. One view is that such a move is not only desirable but that it can attract and retain high-quality faculty members who have not been able to find tenure appointments at other institutions. This view is supported by testimony of several institutional executives who were present at the meeting.

Remembering that the basic purpose for making faculty members eligible for tenure is to assure academic freedom, without which society would be denied the benefits for which it established its colleges and universities, there would seem to be no greater need for full-time faculty members to have their academic freedom protected than for the regular part-time faculty members.
It would be desirable, in the case of part-time faculty members, however, to limit eligibility for tenure to those with an .50 FTE appointment or more, and to provide, as the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education recommends, namely, that their probationary period should be calculated on a full-time-equivalent basis and not on a calendar year basis. The board's office believes that with such a stipulation, consideration should be given by the board's committee to the merits of extending eligibility to regular part-time faculty with appointments of .50 FTE or more.

Monteured Faculty Number -

Request for Statement as to Reasons for Nonreappointment

Question has been raised as to the state system policy with respect to providing a nonreured faculty member who requests it in writing, a statement concerning the reasons for his nonreappointment.

Under existing policies, the institution is not required to give a statement of its reasons for nonrenewal of the contract of a nonreured faculty member, until or unless the faculty member has presented plausible evidence that his academic freedom or his constitutional rights have been violated. Constitutional questions that arise in cases of nonrenewal usually are related to one or more of the following: freedom of speech (First Amendment), protection against self-incrimination (Fifth Amendment); due process (Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments).

It is to be recognized, as the AACP has pointed out, that it may not always be to the advantage of the faculty member to be informed of the reasons for his nonreappointment, particularly in writing. If he is informed of them, he may at some point in his career place the burden of proof. And if a written record is kept of the institution's reasons for nonreappointment, it may become the basis of the institution's position in his field. But in the event of a possible conflict, the faculty member's record in particular, or his knowledge of the institution's position, may be subject to the faculty member's record. Again, still, there may be occasions when the individual's interests would warrant his being told the reasons for nonreappointment, perhaps the reason for nonreappointment is unrelated to the faculty member's competence in his field, or it is based on erroneous information which the faculty member could readily correct.

Statements supplied the nonreured faculty member setting forth the reasons for his nonreappointment should be a single statement of the facts (e.g., that the program area has been discontinued, that through appropriate procedures it has been determined that the faculty member has met the standards for retention in some important particular), not a charge which the institution would be bound to defend as a condition of nonrenewal.

Given the litigious world in which we live, institutions might well wish to place responsibility for providing such statements on a single individual or a very limited number of individuals, should it be determined that such statements ought to be given nonreured faculty.

With respect to this issue the National Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education recommended as follows:

The commission recommends that the probationary faculty member who is not recommended for reappointment or for award of tenure should always be given an explanation of the action in an informal conference with the department chairman, and, if he requests it, should be given a statement of reasons in writing.

Explaining its recommendation, the commission said:

The commission believes that if the institution's criteria for reappointment and for award of tenure are clearly set forth, and if the probationary period is conducted in an open, positive, and helpful manner, as our other recommendations contemplate, the interests of both the institution and the faculty member will be best served if reasons for nonrenewal or denial of tenure are always supplied if requested.

Institutional practice with respect to the giving of reasons for nonreappointment of nonreured faculty, as reflected in the figures from a Higher Education Panel survey conducted in the spring of 1972 was found to be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent of Universities</th>
<th>Percent of 4-Yr. Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>13.3% 19.4% 26.9% 14.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>50.8 61.3 34.9 46.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>35.9 19.4 36.2 38.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commenting on the foregoing figures, the commission observed:

Public institutions, probably because of their greater exposure to legal action, provide reasons more frequently than do private institutions; but only a small proportion in each of the categories never provide reasons.

In the state system, the Administrative Rules do not require that the institutions give to the probationary faculty member written reasons leading to the institution's decision not to reappoint him, although some of the institutions do or are willing to do so. The issue is as to whether the board's Administrative Rules should require that they do so.
The board's office believes that this issue should be left in abeyance for the present. Some pending court decisions may have a bearing on the issue. Further consideration can be given by the board to this issue following the action of the courts.

Other Changes Which Have Been Proposed But Which Are Not Included in the July 23 Version of the Document Either Because No Formal Action Was Taken by the Academic Affairs Committee or Because They Have Been Drafted Since the June 22 Meeting

The following issues are referred to in this document:

- Tenure for Regular Part-Time Faculty (pp. 1-2)
  - Modifications Required in the July 23 Version of Proposed Administrative Rules in Order to Make Tenure Applicable to Part-Time Faculty (pp. 3-5)
  - Tables Giving Number of Regular Part-Time Appointments by FTE, Rank, and Tenure Status, Six Multi-Purpose Institutions and OTH, and the UO Medical School, Nursing School, and Dental School (pp. 6-9)
- Language Providing for Discretionary Board Review of Academic Non-Disciplinary Personnel Decisions (p. 11)
- Provisions for More Detailed Language Governing Faculty Participation in Discussions Incident to Changes and Priorities in Institution's Academic Program in the Light of Financial Strangency (p. 13)
Tenure for Regular Part-Time Faculty

A discussion of the issue of tenure for regular part-time faculty is presented in the July 23 version of the tenure document on pp. 47-53.

Just a word concerning the question of making regular part-time faculty eligible for tenure.

Within the institutions, opinion on this issue is divided, although the weight of opinion among faculty groups and institutional representatives is clearly in support of making regular part-time faculty eligible for tenure. The three major faculty organizations (AAUP, OSEA, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate) champion this cause. Some administrators favor it. Others would prefer to maintain tenure for regular, full-time faculty.

We have reviewed in the tenure document (p. 49) the principal reasons underlying support for inclusion of part-time faculty in the tenure provisions. Those who oppose it do so in some instances because they are unsure as to whether a person employed .50 FTE will have the same professional commitment to keeping abreast in his field as one employed 1.0 FTE is likely to.

In the proposed draft of the changes that would be required in the July 23 version of the proposed tenure rules in order to make tenure applicable to persons with a .50 FTE assignment or more but less than 1.0 FTE, we have provided that the probationary period of service should be counted on an FTE year basis rather than a calendar year basis. The result would be that a faculty member with .50 FTE assignment could be held to a probationary period of service double in length to that to which a faculty member on a 1.0 FTE assignment could.

There are some in the state system who vigorously oppose extending the probationary period of service for part-time faculty in this manner. President MacVicar expressed his opposition at the June 22 meeting, and the principal faculty organizations (AAUP, OSEA, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate) are also opposed to a lengthened probationary period for part-time faculty.

Perhaps, if the committee and the board desire to make regular part-time faculty eligible for tenure, some compromise could be reached in which the probationary period would be lengthened for part-time people, but not so much as suggested in our materials. Incidentally, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education favors a lengthened probationary period for regular part-time faculty.
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Meeting #411-134
July 23, 1973

We enclose herewith the following additional materials relating to this issue:

A statement concerning the modifications that would be required in the July 23 version of the proposed rules if eligibility for tenure were to be extended to academic staff members employed at .50 FTE or more, but less than 1.0 FTE, rather than being restricted to regular full-time faculty members, as in the present July 23 version of the proposed rules (pp. 3-5)

A set of tables which shows the number of tenured and untenured faculty members in state system institutions employed at .50 FTE or more, but less than 1.0 FTE. The first table gives the consolidated figures for the six multipurpose institutions (OU, OSU, PSU, SDS, OCE, ECO) and OTI. The succeeding three tables in the set provide similar information for the UD Medical School, Nursing School, and Dental School (pp. 6-9)
Meeting #411-135
Office of Academic Affairs
Oregon State System of Higher Education

July 23, 1973

Modifications Required in the July 23 Version of Proposed Administrative Rules
In Order to Make Tenure Applicable to Part-Time Faculty

Presented below are the changes required in order to make the July 23 version of the proposed administrative rules governing tenure applicable to part-time faculty.

- Underlined words included in the parentheses (and italicized) are words that are not now in the board's Administrative Rules but which are included in the July 23 version of the administrative rules, and which would be excluded were the rules to be modified to cover part-time faculty.

- Words which would be added to the July 23 version to make tenure applicable to part-time people are underlined doubly.

P. 15, AR 41.105, item #2 -

2. Annual tenure appointments are appointments given to (full-time regular faculty) faculty employed .50 FTE or more who the institution considers to be on the tenure track.

P. 16, AR 41.110, item #1 -

1. Indefinite tenure may be awarded to qualified regular faculty employed (full time) on appointments of .50 FTE or more in one of the following academic ranks:
   - When tenure is awarded to an individual on a part-time basis, it shall be in accordance with the rules of the institutional faculty and the institution shall consider the faculty member for tenure on a part-time basis.

P. 19, AR 41.145 to be added:

41.145 Appointment of Regular Part-Time Faculty beyond the FY Equivalent of the Fifth Consecutive Year

A faculty member on a part-time tenure-related annual appointment (see AR 41.130) of .20 FTE or more, shall, in the second (and all succeeding) appointments following completion of the FY equivalent of the fifth consecutive year, be awarded tenure or given notice of termination effective with the completion of this appointment.
### UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MEDICAL SCHOOL
#### 1972-73

Headcount of Faculty, by rank, under 1.00 F.T.E., with Indefinite and Yearly Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.T.E.</th>
<th>Indefinite</th>
<th>Yearly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.50 - .59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes persons appointed at Geographic Full Time F.T.E.

\[\text{UOMS Budget Office 6/18/73}\]

### UNIVERSITY OF OREGON SCHOOL OF NURSING
#### 1972-73

Headcount of Faculty, by rank, under 1.00 F.T.E., with Indefinite and Yearly Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.T.E.</th>
<th>Indefinite</th>
<th>Yearly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.50 - .59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{UOMS Budget Office 6/18/73}\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table above represents the distribution of positions and salary status for the academic year 1971-72.*
### Number of Regular Part-Time Appointments by FTE, Rank, and Tenure Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Professor Tenure</th>
<th>Assistant Tenure</th>
<th>Assistant Tenure</th>
<th>Sr. Instr. and Instructor Tenure</th>
<th>Total Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.90-.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.80-.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70-.79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.60-.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50-.59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Report number of cases including only those people who are budgeted in instructional (teaching) budgets, excluding people who are on 600 hour status, visiting status, over age 65, or whose partial appointment is the result of a sabbatical leave. For the purpose of this report, recurring appointment means a person who is on the 1972-73 budget in a part-time position and was also on the 1971-72 budget in a part-time position.
## UNIVERSITY OF OREGON SCHOOL OF NURSING
### 1972-73

Headcount of Faculty, by rank, under 1.00 F.T.E., with Indefinite and Yearly Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.T.E.</th>
<th>.50 - .59</th>
<th>.60 - .69</th>
<th>.70 - .79</th>
<th>.80 - .89</th>
<th>.90 - .99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UOES Budget Office 6/18/73

---

## UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MEDICAL SCHOOL
### 1972-73

Headcount of Faculty, by rank, under 1.00 F.T.E., with Indefinite and Yearly Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.T.E.</th>
<th>.50 - .59</th>
<th>.60 - .69</th>
<th>.70 - .79</th>
<th>.80 - .89</th>
<th>.90 - .99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes persons appointed at Geographic Full Time F.T.E.

UOES Budget Office 6/18/73
### University of Oregon Dental School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>Asst Prof</th>
<th>Assoc Prof</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Res Assoc</th>
<th>Res Asst</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.50-.59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.60-.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70-.79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.80-.89</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.90-.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of tenured faculty = 56
69 people, less than 0.5 FTE

---

**Language Providing for Discretionary Board Review of Academic Non-Disciplinary Personnel Decisions**

We present below language which would provide for discretionary board review of academic non-disciplinary personnel decisions. The board's Administrative Rules already presently provide for board review of decisions involving possible applications of sanctions for cause (AR 41.375, 41.380). The language below would provide for discretionary review by the board of academic non-disciplinary personnel decisions.

**AR 41.395 Discretionary Review of Academic Non-Disciplinary Personnel Decisions**

An academic staff member aggrieved by a non-disciplinary personnel decision by an institutional executive may appeal such decision as follows:

1. Any request for review by the board or the board’s office shall be made only after the academic staff member has exhausted all internal institutional procedures appropriate for reviewing the decision in question.

2. All requests for review shall be in writing, shall be addressed to the chancellor, and shall state succinctly the basis of the grievance and the reasons of academic policy which justify further review of the decision of the institutional executive.

3. Any decision to take further action with respect to an alleged grievance shall be discretionary with the board.

4. Any such requests for review shall be assigned to the chancellor or his designated representative for examination. Informal settlement if possible, conduct of a conference or hearing, if necessary, and report and recommendation to the board if the grievance is not resolved.

5. The consideration of any such request shall be limited to appellate review of alleged errors by the appointing authority with respect to procedure, adherence to the Administrative Rules or other applicable law, and fair consideration of the facts. The scope of review shall not include a de novo review on the merits of the institutional executive’s delegated discretion.
Provisions for More Detailed Language Governing Faculty Participation In Discussions Incident to Changes and Priorities in Institution's Academic Program In the Light of Financial Exigency

AR 41.320 (pp. 25-27) provides for termination not for cause (financial exigency, program reductions or eliminations).

The proposed rule in the second paragraph on page 26 provides that in considering such matters as financial exigency or program termination or elimination, the institutional executive "shall confer in a timely way with appropriate faculty and other institutional councils and with the chancellor and the board concerning the issues involved in arriving at decisions in the foregoing areas."

It has been suggested that more definitive language concerning the role of faculty would be helpful in clarifying the role of faculty and institutional executive in the procedures through which these issues are to be dealt with. The following language has been suggested:

Determinations of changes and priorities in the institution's academic program in the light of financial exigency shall be made by the institutional executive with consideration of the formal recommendations of heads of academic departments and of a body representative of the faculty.

Were the foregoing provision to be adopted by the board, it could be added as the third paragraph, p. 26.